DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 201 575 SO 013 334

TITLE	The Hands-Off Pilot Study of the Skills for Ethical Action Instructional Materials. Volume I: The Case Studies.
INSTITUTION	Research for Better Schools, Inc., Philadelphia, Pa.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	30 Nov 77
NOTE	236p.; For a related document, see ED 141 253 and SO 013 335.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC10 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Case Studies; Comparative Analysis; Course Content; *Course Evaluation; Educational Research; *Ethical Instruction; Field Tests; Junior High Schools; *Moral Development; Moral Values; Questionnaires; Rural Schools; Rural Urban Differences; Secondary Education; Skill Development; Student Attitudes; Tests; Urban Schools

ABSTRACT

Recognizing that similar approaches to moral education operate differently in different school settings, this paper assesses the methods and impact of a moral education course (Skills for Ethical Action, SEA) in six junior high school settings. SEA is an instructional program designed to teach seventh, eighth, and ninth grade students a strategy/process for acting ethically in their daily lives. The specific purposes of this report were to study and evaluate SEA classroom use in a variety of settings under conditions that were free of direct influence of SEA developers. The evaluation method used placed strong emphasis on recording and describing in detail the implementation of SEA activities and on evaluating teacher and student response to the course. The document is presented in nine major sections. Section one introduces the study. Section two describes methods of sampling, data collection, and data analysis. Sections three through eight present case studies of SEA use in suburban and urban junior high schools. For each case study, information is presented on background, implementation, acceptability, teacher interviews, effectiveness, student responses to questionnaires, and conclusions. The final section summarizes the report. Findings indicated, as hypothesized, that SEA operated and was received very differently in different classrooms. The conclusion is that SEA should be altered to improve its acceptability and effectiveness for a wider variety of school settings. Questionnaires, tests, and tables are appended. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Ullik Roulk

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED201575

THE HANDS-OFF PILOT STUDY OF THE SKILLS FOR ETHICAL ACTION INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS

VOLUME I:

THE CASE STUDIES

Submitted to

National Institute of Education

by

Research and Development Division
Research for Better Schools, Inc.
1700 Market Street/Suite 1700
Philadelphia, Pa. 19103

November 30, 1977

SP 013 334

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION	PAGE
LIST OF TABLES	vii
INTRODUCTION	1
Purposes of the Present Study	1
Skills for Ethical Action, the 1976-77 Version	4
Contents of the Present Report	8
METHODS	11
Sampling Procedures and Sample Description	11
Arrangements for Study Participation	14
Data Collection	14
Data Analysis	26
CASE S7: A SUBURBAN SEVENTH GRADE	31
Background	31
Implementation	32
Acceptability	36
Effectiveness	41
Miscellaneous	45
Summary and Conclusions	46
CASE U7: AN URBAN SEVENTH GRADE	49
Background	49
Implementation	51
Acceptability	54
Effectiveness	60

SECTION	PAGE
Miscellaneous.	66
Summary and Conclusions.	66
CASE S8: A SUBURBAN EIGHTH GRADE	69
Background	69
Implementation	70
Acceptability.	74
Effectiveness.	78
Miscellaneous.	82
Summary and Conclusions.	82
CASE U8: AN URBAN EIGHTH GRADE	85
Background	85
Implementation	86
Acceptability.	89
Effectiveness.	94
Miscellaneous.	100
Summary and Conclusions.	100
CASE S9: A SUBURBAN NINTH GRADE.	103
Background	103
Implementation	105
Acceptability.	109
Effectiveness.	113
Summary and Conclusions.	118
CASE U9. AN URBAN NINTH GRADE.	121
Background	121

SECTION PAGE

Implementation 123

Acceptability. 126

Effectiveness. 133

Summary and Conclusions. 137

SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION. 141

Implementation 142

Acceptability. 145

Effectiveness. 148

Conclusion 152

REFERENCES. 153

APPENDIX 1. SEA TEACHER AND STUDENT BACKGROUND INFORMATION FORM. 155

APPENDIX 2. TEACHER'S LESSON REPORT FORM 159

APPENDIX 3. SEA OBSERVATION PROCEDURES FOR THE HANDS-OFF PILOT STUDY 163

APPENDIX 4. QUESTIONS FOR THE FINAL INTERVIEW WITH THE SEA TEACHERS. 169

APPENDIX 5. THE END-OF-COURSE QUESTIONNAIRE AND CODING/SCORING DIRECTIONS. 173

APPENDIX 6. THE INSTRUCTIONAL OBJECTIVES, UNIT TESTS, AND SCORING DIRECTIONS. 181

APPENDIX 7. GENERAL MORAL AND VALUES CHARACTERISTICS MEASURES. . 211

APPENDIX 8. ANALYSIS AND SUMMARY PROCEDURES USED WITH THE INTERVIEW AND CLASSROOM OBSERVATION REPORTS, AND SOME OF THE END-OF-COURSE QUESTIONNAIRE ANSWERS IN WRITING THE SEA CASE STUDIES. 235

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1	Focal Questions of the Hands-Off Pilot Study.	3
2	School, Teacher and Class Characteristics of the SEA Sample	15
3	Interscorer Agreement, Internal Consistency, and Test-Retest Correlations of the General Measures.	24
4	Case S7-A's Unit Pre- and Posttest Averages as Percents of the Maximum Possible Scores on Those Tests. . .	42
5	Case S7-B's Unit Pre- and Posttest Averages as Percents of the Maximum Possible Scores on Those Tests. .	42
6	Case U7-A's Unit Pre- and Posttest Averages as Percents of the Maximum Possible Scores on Those Tests. .	60
7	Case U7-B's Unit Pre- and Posttest Averages as Percents of the Maximum Possible Scores on Those Tests. .	61
8	Case U7's Means and Standard Deviations of the General Measures Related to the Other Persons Theme in SEA . .	64
9	Case S8's Unit Pre- and Posttest Averages as Percents of the Maximum Possible Scores on Those Tests.	79
10	Case U8's Unit Pre- and Posttest Averages as Percents of the Maximum Possible Scores on Those Tests.	94
11	Case U8 and Its Comparison Class' Means and Standard Deviations on Measures Related to the Other Persons Component of SEA	97
12	Case U8 and Its Comparison Class' Means and Standard Deviations on Measures Related to the Reflectivity Component of SEA	98
13	Case S9's Unit Pre- and Posttest Averages as Percents of the Maximum Possible Scores on Those Tests.	114
14	Case S9 and Its Comparison Class' Means and Standard Deviations of the Measures Related to the Reflectivity Component of SEA	117
15	Case U9's Unit Pre- and Posttest Averages as Percents of the Maximum Possible Scores on Those Tests.	133

INTRODUCTION

The following report presents the methods and results of the hands-off pilot study of Skills for Ethical Action (SEA), an instructional program designed to teach seventh-, eighth-,and ninth-grade students a strategy, or process, that enables them to act ethically in their daily lives.[1] Since the fall of 1974, SEA has undergone a number of small-scale classroom tryouts for formative evaluation purposes and has been revised accordingly. All of these earlier tryouts have been conducted with some degree of participation by the SEA development staff in the classroom presentation of SEA. The present study differs from previous ones in that a variety of tryout sites were employed and in that the SEA development staff maintained a "hands-off" relation to the teachers and students participating in the study. The participating teachers received information from the SEA development staff concerning SEA presentations only when they were initially introduced to SEA in the site recruitment effort and when involved in the three-hour training/orientation session prior to any SEA lesson presentations.

Purposes of the Present Study

Because the 1976-77 school year offered the first opportunity for study of SEA classroom use under conditions that were for the most part

---

[1]"Ethical Action" is defined in SEA as action undertaken after objectively deciding what is fair, based on consideration of probable consequences to all persons, including oneself.

free of direct influence by the SEA developers, a strong emphasis was placed on recording and describing in detail the implementation of the 1976-77 version of the SEA program and the teacher and student response to the course as presented, as well as considering this SEA version's effectiveness. Because little was known about the extent of variation that might be expected in the implementation of, response to, and effects of, SEA within the target population, a wide variety of settings was sought. With the detailed description of SEA use in a variety of settings being a major concern, the hands-off pilot study was designed as a set of case studies.

Although the report of each of the case studies is designed to present whatever types of information are necessary for a detailed portrayal of that case's use and outcomes of the 1976-77 version of SEA, certain focal questions are considered in all cases. Grouped by general type of question, the focal questions are presented in Table 1.

In addition to the purpose of answering the focal questions in each of the case studies, the hands-off pilot study provided other essential data necessary for the revision of SEA. The use of the data for that formative evaluation is described in Volume II of this report.

TABLE 1
Focal Questions of the Hands-Off Pilot Study

Implementation

1. Where (if at all), how, and why did the teacher depart from the content and/or procedures of the SEA lesson presentation intended by the SEA developers?

2. How was SEA fitted into the school's curriculum, with regard to (a) subject matter, (b) time required and rate of presentation, and (c) accountability of students for SEA work?

Acceptability

3. Did the teacher perceive that the SEA Teacher's Manual provided adequate guidance?

4. Did the teacher perceive that the SEA lessons and materials:

   a. required no more than reasonable preparation time and resources?

   b. provided for quality classroom instruction for their students?

5. What evidence from the students, the teachers, and/or the SEA evaluation staff -- through observation and/or testing -- reveals that SEA:

   a. had modes of presentation that were well received?

   b. resulted in no major classroom management problems?

   c. was neither too easy nor too difficult for students?

   d. resulted in no harm to the students?

   e. interested and involved the students?

Effectiveness

6. Did the students improve from before to after relevant SEA instruction in their performances on measures of SEA objectives?

7. Did the students improve from before to after the total SEA program experience in their performances on measures of general moral and value characteristics believed to be related to, but not directly taught in SEA?

8. Did the students perceive that the SEA lessons helped them learn useful information and skills?

Skills for Ethical Action, the 1976-77 Version

The version of SEA available for the hands-off pilot study consisted of 38 lessons, each designed for half-hour instructional periods and related to one another in a fixed order of presentation. Salient aspects of the program are the SEA strategy, the unit organization of the instruction, the objectives, and some characteristics of the SEA materials themselves. These topics are discussed in the following subsections.

The SEA strategy. The instructional core of the SEA program is a six-step strategy which combines actions consistent with self-held values, ethical decision-making, and evaluation of completed actions.

In the first step, Identify the Value Problem, the students describe a situation that presents a problem or that indicates they (the students) are not doing enough to show that one of their values is meaningful. They name the value involved and then formally state their problem.

The second step, Think Up Action Ideas, asks the students to brainstorm ideas for actions that might help them handle their problem. The students then check their action ideas to make sure they are stated specifically and are possible to implement.

Consider Self and Others is the third step of the strategy. Here the students think about how their action ideas might affect their own values, feelings, health and safety, and possessions. They also obtain information, using course-taught methods, about how others might be

affected in these four areas. Finally, the students consider what might happen if everyone acted as they are thinking of acting.

The next step, Judge, asks the students to objectively review and summarize the information gathered in Step 3, and to decide whether their actions would be ethical, i.e., whether the actions would have mostly positive effects on everyone. They can change or reject those actions which they deem not ethical.

In the fifth step, Act, the students choose one of the actions judged to be ethical and make a commitment to carry out that action. They are also called upon to persevere until the action is completed.

In the final step of the strategy, Evaluate, the students examine the effects of the action they have completed and ask themselves whether it did indeed produce mostly positive effects on everyone. They also review how well they used each strategy step and examine the importance of the value which they acted upon.

The units of SEA instruction. The 38 SEA lessons were grouped sequentially into four units.

The first unit consisted of ten lessons. Those lessons presented the student responsibilities in SEA, analyzed the SEA definition of "ethical action," and introduced the SEA strategy.

In the 11 lessons of the second unit, the students practiced using the strategy in a simulation involving four case studies about teenagers holding specified values. The practice involved working together with classmates in small groups on the cases, utilizing the strategy steps.

The Act step was simulated by acting out the action in a drama form. The definition of "ethical action," and the dispositions of caring for others, of acting consistently with one's values, and of being fair in judging potential consequences were linked to the strategy steps. In addition, role-taking and decision-making skills were introduced.

The third unit contained nine lessons during which the students practiced using the strategy to handle a value problem from an actual situation of their own. The students were to expand their knowledge of their own values by ranking general value terms and were provided with further practice in application of the skills introduced earlier. This unit emphasized the subprocesses needed to complete each step of the strategy, and the students were expected to actually carry out the action they had decided was ethical.

In the final unit, the students were asked to use the strategy in order to make one of their own values more meaningful in their lives. The unit stressed the value-oriented initiation of the strategy use rather than the specific problem-oriented mode of the previous unit. Again, the students were called upon to really carry out the action. The concept of "others" was expanded to include persons beyond those immediately and obviously involved. The course ended with the attempt to have the students project future circumstances in which they might use the strategy. This unit consisted of eight lessons.

SEA objectives. SEA was designed to teach the strategy described previously. As the student practiced using the strategy, it was postu-

lated that the strength of several values or dispositions would be increased also. These are the tendency to act on self-proclaimed values, concern for the welfare of others, and objectivity in decision-making. Finally, in addition to fostering these dispositions, SEA was to develop the skills needed to use the strategy to translate values into actions which have been objectively considered and judged to have mostly positive effects on everyone, including oneself.

SEA materials. The instructional materials included cassette audio tapes from which 34 of 38 SEA lessons could be presented to the class. (Although these taped lessons could be used, almost three-fourths of the parts of the 34 lessons allowed for presentation by the teacher instead of the tape.) The instruction on the tapes was provided in Units I and III by a male narrator who spoke slowly and in Units II and IV by a female narrator who spoke more rapidly. Also, the tape presentations included at times modeling of some of the content by boys and girls, some Black, some White. Finally, music was used as a part of each lesson introduction as well as during the times allowed on tape for students' activity.

The lessons referred the students to visual materials in the form of 44 study book pages and three filmstrips which gave visual support to the primarily audio instruction. In addition, there were 21 worksheets to be completed in conjunction with the SEA lessons.

The SEA Teacher's Manual included suggestions for materials preparation, classroom arrangements, and the objectives and lesson plans for

each of the 38 lessons. It also included outline descriptions of all presentation modes possible (tape, tape and teacher, or teacher) and suggestions for remedial activities. In addition, the Manual contained a reproduction of each audio script, annotated with suggested discussion questions; guidelines for teacher participation; classroom management recommendations; copies of student materials and tests; and scoring directions for each of the four course tests. In all the SEA Teacher's Manual had about 680 typescript pages and was contained in a 2½-inch-thick, three-ring binder.

Contents of the Present Report

The present report is divided into two volumes. The contents of this volume, Volume 1, are described in the following paragraphs. The contents of Volume II are described in the Introduction to that report.

As indicated previously the design used in this hands-off pilot study of SEA is a set of case studies. The sampling of the cases, the procedures for teacher participation in the study, and the methods of data collection and analysis are presented in the following methods section, with reference also to the Appendices, which contain copies of the forms and measures used.

After the methods section come the reports of the case studies. Six cases were studied, and a section of this report is devoted to each of the cases. In each case study section, relevant case background information, and the findings with regard to the focal questions presented in Table 1 are presented for that particular case. At the end of each

case study section there is a summary of all information, with the purpose of answering for that particular case the questions: "Was it a good test of SEA?" "Did the teacher and students value and enjoy SEA?" "Was SEA effective in producing desired changes in the students?"

Following the six case study report sections there is a summary section. Not intended as an averaging across the cases, the summary is instead an overview of the variability among the cases. Also, interspersed in the summary is commentary on the limitation of the methods and findings of the study.

METHODS

In this section the sampling procedures, sample description, arrangements for study participation, and data collection and analysis proceedures are presented.

Sampling Procedures and Sample Description

The target population of SEA was considered to be school students in the seventh, eighth, and ninth grades. Two teachers in two separate schools were sought for each of the three grade levels. In order to provide for study of possible differences in implementation, acceptability, and effects, a variety of school settings was sought. The major dimension of variety was the urban-suburban distinction with a seventh, eighth, and ninth grade being sought for each of the settings. Also, as another aspect of variety, the sampling plan called for obtaining one religiously-oriented urban or suburban school, in addition to the other, public schools.

Recruitment. The recruitment procedure was initiated in most cases by phone contact by the SEA developer or evaluator with a school district-level administrator responsible for curriculum and/or instruction. If this phone introduction produced some interest, materials descriptive of both SEA and the conditions for teachers' participation in the study were mailed to the district administrator. The mailing was followed with further interchange, in which the administrator identified schools, and in some cases teachers, who were to be contacted for further discussion

of the study. At that point school principals were contacted, and they determined what teachers might be involved. This sampling procedure was intended to be similar to a marketing procedure that SEA might undergo in later dissemination, and insofar as there is a similarity, the teachers and students involved in the study can be assumed to be similar to future users of SEA.

The major exception to the above sampling procedure occurred when a teacher or principal heard about SEA through a colleague and came to the SEA staff to ask for further information and an opportunity to use SEA materials. Because this circumstance was also considered similar to possible future routes for dissemination, it was also considered an appropriate route into the sample for the present study.

The particular way in which each of the teacher and class cases was obtained for the sample is described in the initial part of the background section of each case study report.

For prudential reasons, more teacher and class cases were recruited than could be reported on. Eleven teachers from nine schools received the three-hour orientation session and began to present SEA. One teacher was able to present SEA only once a week, which was sufficient only to complete lessons through Unit II. Thus, that teacher's classes are not included in this sample.

Two other teachers discontinued SEA presentation by the middle of the first unit, and are also not included in the sample. One of these teachers discontinued SEA after very strong student opposition to their

participation in the study, apparently based on negative reactions of these ninth graders to the pretesting sessions and the content and tone of the first few audio taped lessons. The second teacher discontinued SEA with his Title I program eighth-grade class because he believed he would have to slow the pace of instruction so much that he would not have time to complete SEA and the other subject matters he taught these students. Both teachers who discontinued SEA presentations were in schools in which other teachers were presenting SEA; the former teacher was in the same school as the teacher and class reported later as Case S9, while the latter was in the same school as Case U9.

Finally, two of the remaining eight teachers completed SEA, but are not included in this report because of the additional effort required to go beyond the analyses and summaries for the six cases to which the SEA staff was committed. The two of the eight that were excluded from analysis and summary were the last two of the eight to initiate involvement with SEA.

For practical reasons all schools contacted were in a single large city and its surrounding suburban areas.

The sample. Six teachers and the class(es) to which they presented SEA constitute the sample. A teacher and his or her class(es) are discussed in the following pages as a "case." Thus, there are six cases in the sample. The six cases are from six schools, three of which are in urban (U) settings and three of which are in suburban (S) settings. Within each setting the three cases include a seventh (7), eighth (8),

and ninth (9) grade class or classes. Cases are labeled by these two characteristics; e.g., S7 refers to the suburban seventh grade case and U9 refers to the urban ninth grade case. Both S7 and U7 involved two classes; these shall be identified by the labels S7-A, S7-B, U7-A, and U7-B. Only one class was involved in each of the other four cases. Table 2 provides other information concerning the cases.

Additional information is presented concerning each case in the background section of each case study report.

Arrangements for Study Participation

In order to become involved in presenting the SEA program to their classes, teachers had to be able to agree to present the full SEA program of 38 lessons, and assist the SEA field coordinator and evaluator in data collection. They also were required to participate in a three-hour training workshop prior to beginning the program. The workshop was designed to familiarize them further both with the SEA program, a part of which they were asked to experience as students, and with the data collection needs of the study.

In return RBS supplied the SEA materials free of charge and paid the teachers an honorarium for time required above and beyond their normal preparation. Also, RBS indicated that steps would be taken to preserve the anonymity of the students, teachers, and schools involved in the study.

Data Collection

The overall purpose of collecting data on the classrooms involved

TABLE 2

School, Teacher, and Class Characteristics of the SEA Sample

Characteristics	Case					
	S7-A/S7-B	U7-A/U7-B	S8	U8	S9	U9
School[a]						
Type	Pub.	Pub.	Cath.	Pub.	Pub.	Pub.
Grades	6-7	K-8	1-8	5-8	9-12	7-9
Size	400	600	260	1660	1530	1450
% Non-White	1	35	4	99	1	100
% Federal lunches	5	50	N.A.	50	"Few"	"Majority"
Teacher[b]						
Sex	M	M	M	F	M	M
Race	W	B	W	B	W	B
Years teaching	13	24	14	29	13	16
Class						
Size	29/28	30-35 each	18	35	27	18
% Non-White	None	33/33	6	100	None	100
Mean verbal[c] ability percentile rank	70/64	30/14	53	38	29	4

[a]Information was obtained through a school administrator by either the SEA field coordinator or the SEA evaluator.

[b]Information concerning the teacher and the class -- with the exception of the verbal ability measure -- was obtained either from a form the teacher completed (presented as Appendix 1) or from classroom observation by the SEA field coordinator.

[c]The figure given is the grade-related percentile rank of the class mean on the verbal part of the Cooperative School and College Ability Test, Series II (SCAT) administered by the SEA evaluator prior to SEA instruction. Form 3A of the SCAT was used for all classes. For further information concerning the SCAT, see SCAT Series II: Handbook. Educational Testing Service: Princeton, N.J., 1967.

in the hands-off pilot study was to provide answers to the focal questions presented in Table 1. For convenience here, the data collection procedures are divided into four areas. These areas are implementation, acceptability to the teachers, acceptability to students, and effectiveness. Information was obtained in each of these areas by a variety of methods.

Implementation and teacher acceptance. The first two areas of concern, implementation and acceptability to teachers, will be dealt with together. These areas of concern relate directly to the focal questions 1 through 5, presented in Table 1 of the Introduction to this volume. Information in these areas was collected using four procedures -- the SEA teacher report, the periodic follow-up interview, classroom observations, and the final interview.

The participating SEA teachers completed a teacher's report form on each of the 38 lesson presentations. The teacher report form is presented as Appendix 2. Some parts of this form relate to topics of implementation (e.g., time used and presentation differed from procedure in Manual), while others refer to issues of teacher acceptance of SEA as implemented (i.e., difficulty, management problems, and others listed in the "Checkpoints" at the bottom of the first page). All completed teacher report forms are maintained in the SEA project's files.

In order to review and clarify the teacher's reports on the lesson presentations and to obtain additional teacher input with regard to the progress of the course, the completed teacher report forms were collected

and reviewed with the teacher in an interview conducted by the SEA field coordinator after every third to fourth lesson presentation. This interview session allowed the teacher to orally communicate perceptions of the course related to all the points on the teacher report form, to further elaborate upon points differing from the way indicated in the SEA Teacher's Manual, and to clarify evaluation checkpoints used. These sessions also allowed the teacher to communicate his/her perceptions of how the students were responding to the course. The comments provided by the teachers during these sessions were either added into the teacher's report for the lesson to which they referred, or, if the comments were of a more general nature, placed in a separate interview report. Both the teacher's reports and the interview reports are maintained in the SEA project's files.

The third procedure, the classroom observation, served to collect more detailed implementation information than the teacher could be expected to remember. The observations were conducted by the SEA field coordinator usually every third to fourth lesson presentation. On three occasions intervals between observations were longer, with up to six lessons intervening on one of those occasions. The observer focused on a number of implementation events during the observed lesson presentations. These events fall into five categories: time, instructional mode, differences between the actual presentation and that depicted in the SEA Teacher's Manual, disruptions outside the presentation, and supplementary assignments. See Appendix 3 for a more complete outline

of the observation procedures.

An observation report was written soon after each less presentation. The heading of each report includes the unit and lesson number observed, the school-class codes, the presentation date, observer's name, number of students, and the total time taken for that lesson. The instructional mode chosen and the time utilized for each lesson part were also noted. The main body of each report includes a description of the lesson presentation, except those aspects presented explicity in the SEA Teacher's Manual. This description includes specification of place in the lesson where the event occurred, the specifics of what happened, an indication of the number of students involved, and the duration of the occurrence. All observation reports are maintained in the SEA project's files.

The final method used in the hands-off pilot study to gain information regarding the teacher's overall impressions of program-related events was an interview conducted by the SEA evaluator with the individual teacher after the program had been presented in its entirety. The final interview covered both implementation issues (such as how SEA was fitted into the teacher's program and what makeup procedures were used for absentees) and acceptability issues (e.g., the adequacy of the SEA Teacher's Manual and perceptions of the taped lessons). A final interview report was compiled based on the answers to these and other related topics, and is maintained in the SEA project's files. See Appendix 4 for a complete listing of the questions asked in the final interview.

Student acceptance. Student acceptance information was collected to answer some aspects of focal questions 5 and 8, as presented in Table 1 of the Introduction to this volume. The two means for gathering information regarding students' acceptance of SEA were a questionnaire administered to all the students upon completion of the program and the classroom observations conducted by the SEA field coordinator every third to fourth lesson presentation. The classroom observations have been briefly described in the previous section, and a more elaborate presentation is available in Appendix 3.

The purpose of the End-of-Course Questionnaire was to measure three areas of student response: disposition, knowledge, and reaction to SEA. The dispositional and knowledge items all relate to SEA objectives and are discussed in the following section on effectiveness. The third area, student reaction to the program, covered a number of items in order to measure perceived value of effects, difficulty, hurt or upset caused, and interest. A copy of the End-of-Course Questionnaire and directions for scoring are presented in Appendix 5. Individual item results were reported in terms of percent of the students giving each answer, and no total or overall score was obtained for this questionnaire. The results were reported and discussed in a report for each of the cases, which is maintained in SEA project's files.

Effectiveness. Two types of learner outcomes were studied: outcomes directly related to SEA objectives and outcomes more general than

SEA objectives, but believed to be conceptually related to SEA themes. The former type of outcomes are referred to in this report as "achievement of objectives," while the latter are labeled either "general effects" or "other effects." These types of data were collected to answer focal questions 6, 7, and 8, as presented in Table 1 of the Introduction to this volume.

Achievement of objectives was studied by use of test items that were constructed to measure directly most of the specified objectives associated with SEA lessons. These items, along with the instructional objectives they were designed to measure and the directions for scoring the items, were reviewed for objective-item congruence by the SEA developer and two RBS evaluators not assigned to the SEA project. Where necessary, modifications were made in the item, or the objective, to bring the two into agreement.

Most of the objectives-referenced items were grouped together into tests by the SEA unit in which the related objectives occurred as instructional objectives. These tests were administered by the teacher both prior to and following presentations of the respective SEA units. With one exception, the same items appeared on both pre- and posttests, though the pretests were titled "Unit Pre-Questions" and the posttests were called "Unit Test." The one exception was the Unit I posttest, which included an additional item calling for specific names presented in the unit. Copies of each of the four posttests are presented in Appendix 6, along with a listing of related instructional objectives and scoring directions. For each test, the answers of at least five students

in each of at least two classes were scored by two independent scorers. After a comparison of the results from the two scorers, scoring directions were clarified and additional double scorings were conducted where necessary to obtain a high degree of agreement. The remainder of the tests were scored by only one of the two scorers. The tests for Units II, III, and IV were scored by a person who was new to the clerical staff and knew very little about SEA or the meaning of the pre- and posttest labels. The Unit I test was scored by one of the SEA staff writers. Reports were written on the pre- and posttest performances of each class on each unit and are maintained in the SEA project's files.

Additional SEA objectives-referenced items were administered as part of the End-of-Course Questionnaire. These are items 1, 2, 7, 8 and the "Test Question" on the third page of the questionnaire, which appears in Appendix 5. This questionnaire was administered by the evaluator soon after SEA presentation was completed. The items were scored by either the SEA field coordinator or the SEA evaluator according to the scoring directions, which are also presented in Appendix 5. Item 8, which relates to anticipated future use of the strategy, and the "Test Question," which has to do with recall of the strategy, were especially critical items in that they index degree of achievement of the objectives for which most other SEA objectives may be considered instrumental.

One type of data collection concerning outcomes more general than the SEA objectives-referenced measures is the general measure administered by the SEA staff to students within a week prior to their in-

volvement in SEA and then again within a week after their completion of the last SEA unit posttest. There were eight general measures, each of which is conceptually relatable to some dominant theme presented in SEA, though they are not designed to be directly associated with particular SEA objectives or activities. The relation of each to a particular SEA theme is described briefly in the introductory pages of Appendix 7, in which the eight general measures are also presented.

The general measures were administered by the SEA staff within two weeks before the presentation of the first SEA lesson and again within two weeks following the presentation of the last SEA lesson. For four of the cases, comparable classes were obtained to serve as test-only comparison classes; these classes completed the measures within two weeks of their related SEA cases. The exact dates of administration and the particular nature of the test-only comparison class for each case are presented in the general effects subsection of that case study report. For five of the six cases, two testing periods of from 35 to 45 minutes each were allowed for administration of the eight general measures; in the remaining case a single 80- to 90- minute period was used. The order in which the general measures were administered was the same in all cases, and is as the measures are sequenced in Appendix 7, with the division of the measures into the two administration periods occurring between the first four, structured-response type of scales and the last four measures, three of which allowed for open-ended answers.

In all cases, the general measures were administered as the last

two of a series of three types of tests. In the testing sessions prior to SEA implementation, the general measures followed administration of the School and College Ability test, Series II, Verbal part, referred to previously in Table 2. In the testing sessions following SEA lesson presentations, the general measures followed administration of the End-of-Course Questionnaire.

The scoring of the first four general measures was done by computer. Footnotes on the measures as presented in Appendix 7 indicate for scoring purposes the reversed items and the subscale membership of each item, where relevant. The scoring directions for the last four measures are interspersed in Appendix 7 after their respective measures. The last four were scored by two independent scorers who underwent a two- to three-hour preparation session prior to each scoring of each measure. The preparation session included a short description by the SEA evaluator of the purpose of the measure, practice independent scoring of 10 to 12 differing protocols, and a detailed review by the scorers and the evaluator of the two scorers' results on the 10 to 12 protocols. The two scorers were members of the clerical staff. Though they scored protocols as grouped by classroom, they were not informed about any characteristics of those classes. The scoring of the pretest administration of the measures occurred soon after the pretesting sessions themselves, and the scorers had no access to pretest scores when scoring the posttests. An index of interscorer agreement was obtained by determining the correlations between the pretest scores of the two independent scorers. The

resultant correlation coefficients are presented in the column labeled "interscorer agreement" in Table 3. For purposes of increased reliability, the scores from the two scorers were added together for all later statistical tests.

TABLE 3

Interscorer Agreement, Internal Consistency, and Test-Retest Correlations of the General Measures

General measure	Interscorer agreement[a]	Internal consistency[b]	Test-retest correlation[c]
Mach's Scale	Objective	.47	.62
Self-Description: Reflectivity	Objective	.55	.32
Learning Environment Scale: Friction	Objective	.67	.46
Modified I-E Scale	Objective	.62	.30
Values Survey	.94	N.A.	.42
Putting Values into Action	.65	N.A.	.45
What Happens to Whom?	.61	N.A.	.56
Before You Decide...	.69	N.A.	.59

[a]The interscorer agreement numbers are the Pearson correlation between two independent scorers' sets of over 350 pretest scores.

[b]These values are the median values of the coefficient alphas, calculated on the basis of pretest item responses in each of the 13 classes -- eight SEA classes and five test-only comparison classes -- involved in the study.

[c]These values are the medians of correlations from the five test-only classes. Three were eighth grade classes; there was also one class each of seventh and ninth graders. The interval between testings of 130 days in the ninth grade class was the shortest, though with no measure was the correlation highest of all the classes. The longest interval between testings was 240 days in the seventh grade class; this class had the highest correlations of all classes for three of the eight measures.

Also included in Table 3 is information related to the reliability of the general measures. The second column presents the coefficient alphas for the structured response scales. These values indicate the extent to which the parts of the measures (i.e., the items) may all be thought of as measuring the same trait. The third column of Table 3 provides a second way of estimating the measures' reliabilities, based upon the extent to which there is across time a stability of what is measured. The time intervals between testings involved in these test-retest estimations of reliability are from two to four times as long as usual test-retest reliability estimation; thus the correlations might be expected to be somewhat lower than usual. Also, both these correlations and the coefficient alphas in the internal consistency column of Table 3 reflect reliability of differentiation within classes; which, though conservative, is the most appropriate basis for estimating reliability for the type of comparisons used in this study. Judging from the values presented in the second and third columns of Table 3, it seems that these general measures have at best only borderline acceptability as reliable measures.

In addition to general effects measurement, there was another type of data collection for outcomes that differed from the SEA objectives. These are labeled "other effects" and include any spontaneous expression or other evidence of positive or negative effects of SEA perceived by the teacher, the students, or the SEA field coordinator. Any such event was noted by the SEA field coordinator or the SEA evaluator, and reported in

an interview report or a classroom observation report, whichever was more appropriate. The data collection for other effects also involved items 3a and 3b of the End-of-Course Questionnaire, which relate to the student's perception of the importance and usefulness of the topics taught in SEA. The End-of-Course Questionnaire and scoring directions are presented in Appendix 5. The data collected with these items are included in the reports on the End-of-Course Questionnaire answers that are maintained in the SEA project's files.

Data Analysis

Analyses of the data collected are best grouped into three subsections: one for all issues of SEA implementation and acceptability, one for achievement of SEA objectives, and one related to general effects analyses.

SEA implementation and acceptability. Analyses related to the description of the SEA program implementation, the acceptability of SEA, and the "other effects" aspect of SEA effectiveness were carried out using the "Analysis and Summary Procedures...," presented in Appendix 8. In general, the procedures (a) refer to a specific question related to the general questions posed in the introduction section of this report, (b) specify the particular reports (e.g., teacher reports, final interview report, and report of End-of-Course Questionnaire answers) that serve as a data source for answering the question asked, (c) describe how to analyze the data source for the appropriate information, and (d) specify how the outcomes of the analysis are to be summarized for pre-

sentation in the case study reports. In order to obtain a greater degree of objectivity in the analysis of the predominantly unstructured, verbal report type data involved, the SEA field coordinator and the SEA evaluator produced independent versions of the analyses for each case. The next step of summarizing for purposes of reporting was carried out by the SEA field coordinator and was checked for agreement with the analysis results and for organization by the SEA evaluator.

Achievement of SEA objectives. The analyses of changes from pretesting to posttesting on the objectives-reference unit tests were by *t*-tests for correlated, or dependent, measures. On the Unit I tests, for which the pretest did not include one of the posttest items, the scores compared were the subscores with the added posttest item scores ommitted. The .05 level of significance was utilized with these tests, though values with probabilities between .05 and .10 are reported as "marginal" or "borderline."

The posttest scores for all unit tests and the performances on the objectives-referenced items of the End-of-Course Questionnaire are also described in terms of level of final achievement. For each unit posttest the level of final achievement is presented in terms of the average score as a percent of the maximum possible score. For the strategy memory item on the End-of-Course Questionnaire, obtaining the level of final achievement involved transforming scores as presented in the scoring directions in Appendix 5, into a more general set of ordered categories that have labels indicating extent of familiarity and useful-

ness of the strategy knowledge, e.g., "basic knowledge only," "partially functional knowledge," and "discursive knowledge." Performances on the other objectives-referenced items on the End-of-Course Questionnaire were discussed in terms of percent of students answering in the SEA objective attainment direction. The purpose in presenting a level of final achievement is to allow for evaluation of the degree of completeness with which SEA objectives were fulfilled at the completion of the related SEA instruction.

General effects. Data analyses related to the general measures involved repeated-measures multivariate analysis of variance. There were three such analyses per case. One involved the two different measures related to the self component of SEA: the Modified I-E Scale and Putting Values into Actio... Another involved the four measures associated with the other persons component of SEA: the Values Survey, Before You Decide..., Mach's Scale, and Learning Environment Scale: Friction. The third analysis was of the reflective aspect of SEA: What Happens to Whom? and Self-Description Questionnaire: Reflectivity. (The descriptions, copies, and scoring directions of these measures are presented in Appendix 7.) In the four cases for which test-only comparison classes were obtained, the statistical test of concern was the interaction between time of testing (first versus second administration) and class (SEA versus test-only comparison). In the remaining two cases, U7 and U9, there was no test-only comparison class, and, therefore, the statistical test of concern was the comparison of pretest scores with posttest scores.

Analyses following the multivariate analyses were contingent on the outcomes of the multivariate ones. If the outcome was statistically significant, the following discriminant function analysis was performed in order to determine the measure(s) on which the differences were most pronounced. If the outcome was not statistically significant, the results of the univariate analysis of variance were investigated for statistical significance. A .10 level of significance was utilized for the multivariate analysis results, while an .05 level was adopted for the univariate results.

CASE S7: A SUBURBAN SEVENTH GRADE

This section is devoted to a report of pertinent background information, and SEA implementation, acceptance, and effectiveness results for the suburban seventh-grade case in the hands-off pilot study of SEA.

Background

SEA staff first contacted the school district's Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and expressed an interest in involving a class of seventh grade students. The assistant superintendent suggested that the principal of the only school in the district that enrolled seventh graders be contacted. The principal was interested in SEA and, notified several teachers of the study.

The school. The school is a public middle school for sixth and seventh grade students. The enrollment during the 1976-77 school year was approximately 400 students, with about half of them being seventh graders.

The school is located in a suburban area from which many commute to work in the nearby large metropolitan area. The guidance counselor believed that as many as two-thirds of the families included persons in professional occupations, with a similar ratio being distinctly above the natural average in income. There are very few students in the school participating in the federally funded free lunch program. The community is stable with turnover being minimal. The counselor also pointed out that Catholic, Jewish, and Protestant backgrounds were about equally

represented in the community. Almost all families were White; there were three Black and four Asian students in the school. The number of students suspended each year for fighting and/or conflict is low, according to the guidance counselor.

The teacher. The teacher was a White man, who had been teaching at the junior high school level and with many of his present colleagues for 13 years. During the 1976-77 school year, he taught English to seventh graders. He characterized his teaching style as "Eclectic: I firmly run an authoritarian, structured classroom with occasional flights of whimsy and a liberal sprinkling of individualization and independent study." On the teaching style scales presented in Appendix 1, he rated himself as (1) much more structured than spontaneous, (2) about equally individual- and class-oriented, and (3) more process- than outcome-oriented.

The classes. Of his four seventh-grade English classes, the teacher chose to present SEA to the two he judged to be most capable. The average score of students in each class on the SCAT Series II, Verbal Part test was well above the national average; one class' mean of 32.3 is at the 70th percentile and the other's of 31.1 is at the 64th percentile in norms for individual seventh graders. The standard deviation was 8.5 in class A and 9.00 in class B. In one class, there were 29 students, all of whom were White. In the second class two of the 28 students were Oriental-Americans and the rest were White.

Implementation

The implementation topics refer to various aspects of how the

course was administered by the teacher. The major topic here is the extent to which the course was presented in the way intended by the SEA developer. Other implementation topics are also included because each reveals a feature of the students' contacts with SEA.

Presentation congruence. The teacher departed only slightly from the developer's intents as manifest in the SEA Teacher's Manual. One slight departure occurred when, in an apparently time-saving move, the teacher had students volunteer to practice an exercise rather than have everyone do it. The only other departure, a moderately serious one, took place when the teacher constructed an outline review form for linking the techniques presented in Unit II to the related strategy step -- a linkage he felt SEA did not present adequately. This review form was considered a moderately serious departure because the outline items might have been confused later with the descriptions of what one does to follow the strategy steps.

The teacher often modified and added to SEA with review forms and different allocations of time. However, all of these except the two above were considered by the developer to have strengthened rather than weakened the SEA presentations.

Presentation time. The teacher began his lesson presentations of SEA in both classes on October 20, 1976, and finished them in both classes on June 6, 1977. He used 42 class sessions to present the lessons with class A, and with class B he used 44 class sessions.

When the teacher initially began presenting the course, there was a

regular rate of presentation of three days per week in both classes. Toward the middle of Unit I, between Lessons 6 and 7, there was a ten-week break in the schedule to allow for parental review of SEA (which is described in the Miscellaneous subsection of this case study) and for Christmas vacation. When lesson presentations were resumed, the rate was two lessons per week for the duration of the course. The one-week long spring break was the only holiday which subsequently affected the rate of presentation, and it occurred between Lessons 3 and 4 in Unit III. After the break in Unit I the teacher spent three minutes reviewing previous lessons; there was no review conducted in Unit III.

The teacher used a fifty-minute class period in which to present the lessons. Ranging from 20 to 50 minutes, the times the teacher reported was used for SEA lesson presentations averaged 32 minutes in class A and 31 minutes in class B. However, the teacher reported times may be conservative; when the SEA field coordinator was observing in the class, her record of the time used was four to five minutes longer than the teacher's.

The teacher was concerned with the time used to present only three of the 38 lessons. In all three he suggested that the Teacher's Manual indicate that more time should be allotted for activities.

Fit within the program. How did the teacher relate SEA to other subjects he or she taught? The teacher teaches English. Although he made no conscious effort to integrate SEA into English (except for using SEA ground rules for participation in discussions), he noted that the

writing done for SEA was one type of seventh grade English activity.

The teacher had begun SEA presentations as replacements of the English subject matter for three of the five weekly class periods. Six lessons were presented in that fashion. By that time he, and some students' parents, had become concerned about insufficient study of English. Then, with the cooperation of the mathematics, social studies, and science teachers, he began to present SEA lessons in these teachers' class periods as well as his own, once every two weeks. In other words, any given subject matter was affected for only one class period every two weeks. By the time he had completed all SEA lesson presentations, the teacher reported that the problem of placement of the course into an already crowded school program was the only reservation he had to using SEA again.

Student accountability procedures. What procedures were used by the teacher to hold students accountable for their SEA studies? From the very beginning of the course, the teacher indicated to the students that they would be graded. He then thought he was going to base grades on the unit tests, class participation, attitude, and willingness to follow directions. However, in the end he used only the test scores on Units II, III, and IV as bases for giving grades. The students were informed and knew that these grades would be averaged in with the other grades they received in English for the final grade report. The teacher believed the students were as serious about SEA tests as with other tests.

Student absences. There were on the average six percent of the

students absent from lesson presentations in class A, and five percent absent in class B. The variability of absences from one unit to the next was not applicable in either class. There was no regular procedure for making up the missed SEA lessons. However, individual attention was given during the following lessons to students who seemed to be having trouble. The teacher felt the students were bright and didn't seem to need much help in picking up after absences. Even so, the teacher did consider make-ups a problem he could not manage well. He suggested that more teacher guidance should be included in the Manual on how to help students make up missed lessons in the course.

Acceptability

In contrast with the above topics dealing with how the course was presented, the following topics all relate to how whatever was presented as SEA was received by the teacher and by the students.

Adequacy of the Teacher's Manual. With the exception of one minor instance, the teacher thought the manual was very good, complete, and well-organized.

Reasonableness of preparation time and resource requirements. There was only one lesson (three percent of all lessons) where the teacher indicated a longer than reasonable preparation time was needed. This occurred in relation to a lesson the teacher deemed as particularly worthwhile.

Instructional quality. Did the teacher believe that the lessons provided good, or at least problem-free classroom instruction? The

teacher was impressed with the development of topics and activities throughout the course. He thought each of the units was well paced, and many times he referred to SEA as having a "logical, thorough development of content."

The teacher considered 83.5 percent of the lessons as resulting in no problems and 6.8 percent as especially good in class A. In class B, he considered 81.4 percent as resulting in no problems and 8.6 percent as especially good. He reported that these ratings were based on the students' reactions to the materials.

Appeal of presentation mode. What were the teacher's and students' evaluations of the audio tape and visual features of the lesson presentations? The teacher stated that his students were "turned off" by the tape mode of presentation. He believed the first narrator was too slow for the students and always seemed to be talking down to them, and though the second narrator's presentation role was better, it seemed as if she were also talking down to the students. He used the tape for 48 percent of the SEA presentations that had a teacher presentation option. With only about five minutes of tape instruction as an exception, he presented all of the last unit in the teacher mode.

However, the teacher did believe that the tapes were helpful, especially for the presentation of detail in initially teaching the course and for the effective modeling provided by the teenagers' voices.

Classroom management problems caused. The teacher reported that with the exception of one occasion, the SEA classroom activities did not

result in classroom management problems. This exception occurred in the first unit when the students got carried away with their role playing during an unequal treatment exercise. This involved less than one percent of the course.

Difficulty level. To what extent are the SEA tasks and objectives at a level of difficulty appropriate for the students in general, and for students of different verbal abilities in particular? The teacher had stated that these two classes were his best sections and could handle most of the SEA material and directions without difficulty. However, the teacher did report that 1.6 percent of the lesson activities in class A and 2.3 percent of the activities in class B caused difficulty for his students. The difficulty arose in both cases with the understanding of a few terms used and the following of directions on several study book pages. On the other hand, the teacher rated 4.1 percent of the activities in class A and 1.8 percent of the activities in class B as not providing enough of a challenge for his students.

On the questionnaire administered after the SEA experience, the students responded to the questions about the difficulty of SEA. The modal response for absolute difficulty in class A was that the course was about right in its difficulty, and they rated the course as of about the same difficulty as their other classes. In class B, the students varied considerably in their assessment of absolute difficulty while being more in agreement that SEA was easier than other courses. The correlation between the answers given here and the verbal ability scores

obtained just prior to students' participation in the SEA course did not approach significance in class A but was statistically significant for class B, perhaps because of the greater variability in class B's perceptions of difficulty. However, in both classes there was statistically significant relations between verbal ability scores and performances on most of the objectives-referenced measures. These relations are discussed in the Achievement of objectives subsection of this Case S7 report.

Harmlessness. Some students in each of the two classes indicated that they were hurt or upset by SEA. In class A, 11 percent of the students made comments on the End-of-Course Questionnaire that were classified as being an invasion of privacy issue (e.g., suggestions that classmates or the teacher saw what personal topics were noted in writing out some of the SEA exercises). In class B, 14 percent of the students gave such responses. Though invasion of privacy was an issue in both classes, no particular aspects of SEA were specified as causing the difficulties; i.e., comments were general.

Student interest level. Did students indicate they were involved and interested in SEA? In the beginning of the course, both teacher and observer accounts indicated that the students seemed to enjoy the various role-playing activities and discussions in the first two units, although several students indicated to the teacher they were bored with Unit I. In the lessons observed in Units III and IV, the students responded appropriately and with on-task behaviors to activities presented,

though full participation was not evident in discussions. At the beginning of Unit IV, the teacher indicated that there was a universal negative reaction to the course which had been building up. He stated that the students considered the course the "Great Bore," and "nasty" comments had been written in the study books; also, pictures and cartoons had been redrawn with new inscriptions downgrading the course.

The teacher was annoyed with the students' disaffections for the course, which had been initially expressed when he first told the class he would be teaching them a new course from Research for Better Schools. (Some students had participated in RBS tryouts of other courses.) The teacher felt the students were just more verbal about their negative feelings later in the course, although those negative feelings were not evident to any degree to the SEA field coordinator until the last lesson of the course when students in class A indicated joy that the course was over.

In response to an item on the End-of Course Questionnaire, the overwhelming majority of students in both classes indicated they were not glad they had the course. In class A 86 percent of the students and in class B 70 percent of the students said they were not glad they had the course because it was boring and a waste of time. On the other hand, 11 percent in class A and 14 percent in class B said they were glad they had the course because they avoided being bored by their regular classwork. The remaining three percent in class A and 14 percent in class B said they were glad to have had the course because it taught them to be ethical or to be better people.

Perhaps related to some students' attitudes toward SEA was the way they were graded for their SEA work. There were a sizable number of students in each class (21 percent in class A and 18 percent in class B) who answered the End-of-Course Questionnaire item related to hurt or upset by saying that their English grades had been lowered by having their SEA performances entered into the grading. This aspect of their experience with SEA was, of course, a function of the way in which the teacher chose to grade and not related to SEA itself.

Effectiveness

The study of the effectiveness of SEA on the students included investigations of the achievement of the explicit SEA objectives and the effects on general moral and value characteristics. In addition, a variety of other outcomes was recorded and is presented under the title of "Other effects" on the following pages.

Achievement of objectives. Students' performances in both classes on the four objectives-referenced unit tests increased significantly from before to after their respective units of SEA instruction.

Class A's unit pre- and posttest averages are presented in TAble 4 as percents of the maximum possible scores. For all four units in both classes the unit posttest scores were below the maximum score possible. As may be seen in the bottom line in Table 4, posttest averages ranged from 45 percent of the possible points in Unit I to 76 percent in Unit III. Across all four tests the average obtained was about 62 percent of all possible points.

TABLE 4

Case S7-A's Unit Pre- and Posttests Averages as Percents of the Maximum Possible Scores on Those Tests

	Unit			
Test	I	II	III	IV
Pretest	18	23	22	42
Posttest	45	64	76	59

Class B's unit pre- and posttest averages are presented in Table 5 as percents of the maximum possible scores. This class' posttest averages were also below the maximum score possible. As may be seen in the bottom line in Table 5, the posttest scores ranged from 52 percent of the possible points in Unit III. The average across all four tests was about 66 percent of all possible points.

TABLE 5

Case S7-B's Unit Pre- and Posttest Averages as Percents of the Maximum Possible Scores on Those Tests

	Unit			
Test	I	II	III	IV
Pretest	12	17	26	39
Posttest	52	65	81	62

At the end of the course when students were asked to describe the SEA strategy completely from memory, the majority of students in both

classes presented the strategy quite thoroughly. In class A, 29 percent of the students had obtained a detailed or discursive knowledge of the strategy. An additional 54 percent outlined the strategy and most major what-to-do aspects. Only 4 percent (one student) listed so few aspects that he/she was judged to have less than a bare minimum of knowledge of the strategy. Thus, using this task as an index, over four-fifths of the students exhibited at least a functional knowledge of the strategy. In class B, 32 percent of the students exhibited a detailed or discursive knowledge of the strategy, going well beyond outlining the steps and recalling all the what-to-do aspects to adding supplementary procedures taught and textual discussions. An additional 64 percent of the students exhibited a functional knowledge of the strategy, outlining the strategy and indicating over one-half of the what-to-do aspects. No one had less than a basic knowledge of the strategy. Thus, almost all of the students in this class exhibited at least a functional knowledge of the strategy, using this task as an index.

The level of objectives achievement was related to verbal ability. There were statistically significant ($p<.05$) correlations in both classes between all five of the measures mentioned above and the students' verbal abilities, which were assessed prior to the SEA experience.

At the end of the course experience the students were also asked about their use of the SEA strategy. Considering their reports of past use and anticipated future use, as well as their levels of knowledge on the above discussed recall question, it is estimated that in class A

less than one-tenth of the class and in class B about one-third of the class were sufficiently experienced, positive about future use, and knowledgeable to put at least some aspects of the strategy into future use. The low level of strategy use estimated here, especially in class A, is most likely a function of the negative attitudes of many of the students toward SEA. In addition, the teacher reported that many students believed that the strategy took too long to use to be of any value.

General effects. The general measures were administered in S7-A and S7-B on October 13 and 14, 1976, and again on June 9 and 10, 1977. The measures were also administered in another seventh-grade class in the same school on the same days. In the statistical analyses that were conducted, the two SEA classes and the testing-only control class were considered as three separate groups, and the initial test was for differences in pre-to-post changes among the three groups. None of the multivariate or univariate analyses yielded results even approaching statistical significance.

Other effects of SEA. Were any non-measured effects of SEA perceived by the teacher or the students? Because the teacher was certain that the students learned the SEA content, he thought that the content would be available to them in the future if they were inclined to draw on it. He believed that those students who were inclined to be ethical would use the knowledge and those that were not so inclined would not use it. However, he said he could not report any observations of SEA's effects on the students.

On the End-of-Course Questionnaire, 68 percent of the students in class A referred to some aspect of SEA as being useful or important personally. However, when they compared the usefulness or importance of SEA to their other courses, 89 percent rated the course as being less useful, while the remaining 11 percent said SEA had about the same usefulness as their other courses.

Eighty-two percent of the class B students referred to at least one aspect of SEA as being useful or important to them personally. While some of the students (32 percent) rated the course as about the same as their other courses, most of the students (64 percent) rated the course as less useful than their other courses. Only one student (4 percent) said SEA was more important.

In summary, while about three-quarters of the students across the two classes listed some aspect of SEA as being useful or important to them personally, the majority of students in both classes rated the course as being less important than their other courses.

Miscellaneous

A lengthy interruption in SEA lesson presentations after the sixth lesson was precipitated by the concerns of several parents that their children's study of English was being slighted. When the principal was informed that parents were concerned, he asked that the SEA lesson presentations cease until a meeting with all possibly interested parents could be held. He then notified all parents with children in the two classes of a general evening meeting, at which the SEA developer, the

SEA evaluator, the teacher and the principal would be available to discuss the program. After the meeting was held, one child was withdrawn from the SEA classes and the teacher gained the cooperation of the students' three other academic teachers to present SEA as often in place of each of the other subject matters as in place of English. During this time, the teacher and the SEA developer did confer with one another, though the interchanges concerned the substance of parent comments and planning for the meeting, rather than how to present the course.

Summary and Conclusions

Overall, Case S7 provided a moderately good test of SEA. The teacher departed only slightly from the SEA developer's intents for SEA lesson presentations. Time allowed to present the SEA lessons was adequate. Students had a high attendance rate, and were encouraged to learn SEA concepts by the external motivation of being graded on their work. Only the disruption in lesson presentation and other possible impacts of the parents' meeting, and the initial negativity toward RBS on the part of some students prevents the situation from providing an ideal test of SEA.

With the exception of a dislike for the pace and tone of the taped instructional narration, the teacher's evaluation of SEA was positive. He was especially enthusiastic about the "logical, thorough development of content" in the course. He thought almost all the lessons were at an appropriate level of difficulty for his class, and there was evidence of only one occasion of a minor class management problem arising from

SEA activities. The SEA Teacher's Manual was considered adequate, and the preparation requirements for lesson presentations were considered reasonable. He did find that fitting SEA into an already full curriculum was difficult; he suggested that a shorter version of the course would be easier to fit, but at the same time cautioned against abbreviation that would disrupt the good development of content.

Though the students seemed attentive and involved during lesson presentations, the teacher believed that they were somewhat negative about SEA even before lessons were begun. By the end of the course, the overwhelming majority in both classes were expressing strong dislike for the course. Most of these students did not think SEA was as useful as their other courses. Some expressed upset with the course for leading to an invasion of their privacy; most expressed boredom and the conviction that SEA had been a waste of time.

However, the students' achievement of SEA objectives was higher than their course-related attitudes would imply. A high level of performance was especially evident on the cognitive type of objectives, such as knowledge of the strategy. On the other hand, there was a very low level of intent to use the strategy, and analyses of the general moral and value characteristics measured revealed no statistically significant changes from before to after SEA. Finally, although the teacher and the students generally thought SEA was not too difficult, there was a positive correlation between the students' verbal abilities and their performances on the strategy knowledge measure and other objectives referenced measures.

The above comments concerning SEA effectiveness and acceptability of the course to the students apply almost equally to both classes. Class B was slightly more positive and achieved slightly more on the unit tests, but the differences are so small as to leave no need for two different summaries.

In conclusion, SEA was well implemented in Case S7 and well received by the teacher. Although SEA was effective in teaching many of its objectives to these students, the students generally considered the course a waste of time. Also, SEA was not effective leading to changes in the more general characteristics measured.

CASE U7: AN URBAN SEVENTH GRADE

This section is devoted to a report of pertinent background information, and SEA implementation, acceptance, and effectiveness results for the urban seventh-grade case in the hands-off study of SEA.

Background

An associate of the developer who had some knowledge of RBS work mentioned the program to the reading specialist at the school where she consulted. The reading specialist talked with the principal and a teacher, and alerted the SEA developer, who then sent course-related information. The principal indicated that the decision would be up to the teacher, who subsequently indicated his desire to use the materials.

The school. The school is a neighborhood public school containing grades K through 7. The enrollment during the 1976-77 school year was approximately 600 students, with about 65 of them being in the seventh grade.

The cultural variety of this urban community is reflected in the school: 65 percent White, 33 percent Black, two percent Spanish-speaking, and a few Orientals. The community is very stable and has maintained approximately the same cultural mix for at least 50 years. The principal said that the families are predominantly blue collar workers with lower than average incomes. About one-half of the students are on federally-funded free lunch program.

Last year was the principal's first year at this school and he

reported there was much fighting, some of it racially related. This year he said there was practically no fighting, due to his direct supervision of several locations where conflicts had occurred (e.g., the lunchroom) and the removal of one student instigator from the school.

The teacher. This seventh grade language arts and social studies teacher is a Black man, who has taught at junior high grade levels for three years. He has spent 21 years teaching at the elementary school level and has been at this school since 1967. He characterized his teaching style as "progressive with reservations." On the teaching style scales presented in Appendix 1, he rated himself as (1) much more spontaneous than structured, (2) much more class-oriented than individual-oriented, and (3) more outcome-oriented than process-oriented.

The classes. There were only two seventh grade classes in the school, and both were involved in using the SEA program for the study. Each class contained from about 30 to 35 students, with both classes being about one-third Black. There also was a Persian-West Indian boy in one of the classes. The teacher perceived one of the classes as being slower academically (not having above a fourth grade reading level) than the other. In this slower class, the average score on the SCAT Series II, Verbal Part was 15.7, which is at the 15th percentile for individual seventh graders on the national norms for the test. The other class had an average SCAT verbal score of 20.8, which is about the 31st percentile for individual seventh graders. The standard deviations for the two classes were 5.97 and 8.24, respectively. These SCAT scores were

obtained prior to any SEA presentations, and though the teacher shifted students between classes, the overwhelming majority stayed in their original class and the distinction between the classes that is indexed by the original SCAT scores is assumed to have been approximately maintained throughout course presentation.

Implementation

The implementation topics refer to various aspects of how the program was administered by the teacher. The major topic here is the extent to which the program was presented in the way intended by the SEA developer. Other implementation topics are also included because each reveals a feature of the student's contacts with SEA.

Presentation congruence. Of a number of variations in SEA lesson presentations, the developer judged several to be important and directly related to SEA's stated objectives. In class A, the teacher omitted, perhaps through oversight, essential discussion questions in two lessons. The overall potential impact on attainment of SEA objectives in class A was judged to be slight.

In class B, students were allowed to make-up their own dramas in Unit II, but no special guidelines were given to relate the dramas to the strategy, and a worksheet that would have posed the necessity of that relation was not used. This departure arose because the teacher wished to allow students the freedom to do their own plays, and perhaps did not realize the importance of relating the strategy to the dramas. On another occasion, the teacher omitted the last two parts of a lesson,

perhaps because of lack of time to complete the lesson, and did not cover these parts at a later time. Together these departures in class B represent a moderate level of departure from the developer's interests, as presented in the Teachers' Manual.

Presentation Time. The teacher began his lesson presentations of SEA in both classes on December 8, 1976, and finished them in both classes on June 9, 1977. He used 45 class sessions to present the lessons with both classes.

When the teacher began presenting the course, there was no regular rate of presentations in either class. Between Lessons 4 and 5 in Unit I there was a two-week break for the Christmas and New Year's vacation. When lesson presentations were resumed, the rate was between one and two lessons per week for the duration of the course. Spring break occurred between Lessons 9 and 10 of Unit II in class A and Lessons 10 and 11 of the same unit in class B. No reviews of immediately preceding lessons were conducted after either one of the breaks.

The time period initially available to present the course was 55 minutes. During Unit III the teacher switched the period during which the course was offered to a 45 minute one. In both classes the overall average time the teacher reported using for SEA lesson presentations was 31 minutes. In class A the longest presentation was 60 minutes while in class B it was 58. In both classes the shortest time period used was 12 minutes.

The teacher was concerned with the time used to present 12 of the

38 lessons. He suggested that shorter lessons were needed for his time periods. However, he recommended in the final interview that the suggested time for the lessons he presented be lengthened to a 45 minute time period in order to incorporate elaboration of directions and definitions, and opportunities for students to discuss and to seek clarification. He knew that the students thought SEA was too long, but he believed they would think that about any new and experimental course.

Fit within the program. How did the teacher relate SEA to other subjects he or she taught? The teacher's regular subject matters are language arts and social studies. He did not try to integrate SEA with either subject matter, though he believed it should be a regular part of language arts because it could be considered to deal with human relations.

Student accountability procedures. What procedures were used by the teacher to hold students accountable for their SEA studies? Whenever the students asked whether they would be graded on their SEA work, the teacher always said "yes." However, he never specified to them how they would be graded or gave them SEA test or other grade reports.

He actually did assign students grades of either satisfactory or unsatisfactory on the basis of their participation during class time; he did not score the tests or use the tests in any way for grading.

Student absences. There were on the average 10 percent of the students absent from lesson presentations in class A, and 21 percent absent in class B. These percents are approximations, as the teacher admitted to forgetting to record student absences for some presentations, and

students would sometimes attend an SEA presentation in the other class rather than their own class. (Toward the end of Unit II the teacher switched approximately nine students from one class to another.) There was no discernible trend in absences in either class; there were day-to-day fluctuations throughout the course.

Complete makeups, including listening to the audio tapes for missed lessons, were conducted only for students who requested the makeups. Partial reviews were conducted as it seemed necessary, and during the group work in Unit II, absentees were brought up-to-date by other group members. Missed worksheets were completed only if they were to be used in later lessons.

Acceptability

In contrast with the above topics dealing with how the program was presented, the following topics all relate to how whatever was presented as SEA was received by the teacher and by the students.

Adequacy of the Teacher's Manual. The teacher said the manual should have been organized to have everything relevant to a particular lesson -- i.e., lesson plans, scripts, worksheets, and study books pages -- in the same location. He had been confused in preparation for and during the presentation of some lessons, because he had to go back and forth in the manual. However, he thought the content was adequate, and everything he needed was presented in the manual.

Reasonableness of preparation time and resource requirements. There was only one instance when the teacher considered the preparation

time beyond reasonable bounds. This occurred in relation to the time and planning required to arrange the class for groups in Unit II and amounted to approximately three percent of all lessons.

Instructional quality. Did the teacher believe that the lessons provided good, or at least problem-free classroom instruction? Ninety-one percent of the lessons presented in class A were evaluated by the teacher as resulting in no problems and 1.8 percent were judged to be especially good. On the other hand, the teacher evaluated 74.3 percent of the lessons in class B as resulting in no problems and 4.9 percent were judged to be especially good. The above percents include modifications made in about 14 percent of the teacher's codings to reflect his comments rather than his ratings which were generally "no problems."

The teacher thought that the sequence of topics and activities in SEA was logical. However, he did believe that coverage of directions and definitions was often too abbreviated. He reported this was especially true in Unit I, which he thought did not provide his students with a thorough enough background for the following units.

Many of the Unit II lessons took a longer time for him to set up materials and student groups than he could readily manage. He thought he could have managed Unit II better with a self-contained class. He also reported that many of his students found the roles played to be unrelated to their life styles, which made it difficult for them to become involved. In addition, the students thought the dramas were just plays, without obvious relation to the SEA strategy.

In Unit III, he believed his students did not personalize the activities as much as intended; he thought they had not been sufficiently prepared to open up until later in the unit. Also, the teacher commented that many of his students did not think in terms of their personal difficulties being "problems." He felt this unit was better organized than Unit II but that the steps and concepts were hard to distinguish from each other.

The teacher thought that the outside activities in Unit IV were valuable in helping the students know their neighborhood better. He felt this unit stimulated an interest which was present in Unit I, but had diminished in Units II and III.

Appeal of presentation mode. What were the teacher's and students' evaluations of the audio tape and visual features of the lesson presentations? The teacher stated that the taped presentation of lessons was adequate. He felt that his students did not seem to mind the narrators, although several students told him that the second narrator presented the information too quickly. Although the teacher believed the narrators were hard to listen to, where a teacher option was available, he used the taped mode of presentation 93 percent in class A and 88 percent in class B. Both he and his students noticed the change in narrators, and he was glad that two narrators were used instead of just one.

The teacher believed the modeling in the tape was effective and presented some concepts better than the narrators. In addition, he appreciated the "quiet, soothing" music presented as background for student activities.

Both the teacher and the students enjoyed the filmstrips. The teacher suggested that additional filmstrips be incorporated into the materials in order to explain some of the more difficult concepts.

Classroom management problems caused. To what extent do the SEA classroom activities result in classroom management problems? The teacher reported that some parts of the Unit II lessons were difficult for him to manage. The problems which arose in both classes were related to the students working in their groups and having a tendency to get carried away with the planning and acting involved in presenting the dramas. In class B there was an additional management problem related to an unequal treatment exercise. These management problems occurred in approximately five percent of all SEA lesson parts.

In addition to the above, a mechanical problem arose at the start of every lesson in both classes. This involved the passing out of student folders. The confusion stemmed from a regular intermixing of the students' folders in one class with those from the other class.

Difficulty. To what extent are the SEA tasks and objectives at a level of difficulty appropriate for the students in general and for students of different verbal abilities? The teacher had stated that these two classes were somewhat homogeneously grouped, with the students in class A having a higher reading level than the students in class B. (He said that students in class B had reading abilities that ranged from the second through fourth grade levels.) The teacher reported that 4.6 percent of the lesson activities in class A and 8.6 percent of the

activities in class B caused difficulty for his students. In both classes the teacher believed that difficulty arose for the students in understanding the activity and exercise directions. The teacher perceived the students in class B as having more difficulty with application of checks for specificity and possibility of action ideas, understanding the word ethical, and distinguishing between the Judge and Evaluate steps.

On the questionnaire administered after the SEA experience, the students responded to the questions about the difficulty of SEA. Most of the students in class A believed SEA was about right in difficulty, while saying it was either about the same or easier than other courses. The majority of students in class B indicated also that SEA was about right in difficulty, but said it was about as difficult as their other courses. In neither class was there a correlation between their answers here and their verbal ability scores obtained just prior to students' participation in the SEA course. However, as discussed later, in class A there was a correlation between the objectives achievement measures and the verbal ability scores, but this relationship was only evident with the Unit IV test in class B.

Harmlessness. The teacher reported that, with the exception of one occasion, the SEA classroom activities could not be considered harmful to his students. This exception occurred in the first unit when some feelings were hurt during an unequal treatment activity, which amounted to less than one percent of the program.

None of the students in class A indicated on the End-of-Course

Questionnaire any hurt or upset caused by the course. Two students (seven percent) in class B were concerned about invasion of their privacy. Although neither reference was specific, one student referred to "people snooping in my business," while the other said "people asked too many questions." Both comments may refer to the condition of being in the study, rather than SEA's activities in themselves.

Student interest level. Did students indicate they were involved and interested in SEA? The teacher reported that in both classes the students were interested and involved with the SEA material presented in Units I and IV, but their interest and involvement were less in Units II and III. The SEA field coordinator's observation reports indicated that students in class A were especially talkative -- seemingly inattentive -- during all seven observed lesson presentations in Units I through III, but a little more subdued during the two observed presentations in Unit IV. On the other hand, students in class B demonstrated on-task behaviors during observed lessons in Units I, III, and IV but not during observed presentations in Unit II.

In each of the two classes students were almost equally divided in their opinions of the SEA course, as indicated by their responses on the End-of-Course Questionnaire. In class A, 44 percent of the students were glad they had the course because they found it useful or valuable to self-understanding. The remaining 56 percent of this class were not glad because the course was "boring." In class B, 52 percent of the students were glad they had the course, because it helped them with difficult

situations. The remaining 48 percent were not glad because they felt the course was boring or a waste of time.

Effectiveness

The study of the effectiveness of SEA on the students included investigations of the achievement of the explicit SEA objectives and the effects on general moral and value characteristics. In addition, a variety of other outcomes was recorded and is presented under the title of "Other Effects" on the following pages.

Achievement of objectives. Students' performance in class A on each of the four objectives-referenced unit tests increased significantly from before to after their respective units of SEA instruction. In class B, student performance increased significantly on two occasions, exhibited no significant difference on a third occasion, and actually decreased significantly on the final testing. Class A's unit pre- and posttest averages are presented in Table 6 as percents of the maximum possible scores; class B's are presented in Table 7.

TABLE 6

Case U7-A's Unit Pre- and Posttest Averages as Percents of the Maximum Possible Scores for Those Tests

	Unit			
Test	I	II	III	IV
Pretest	9	12	11	16
Posttest	30	31	42	27

In both classes the unit test scores were considerably below the maximum score possible for all four units. As may be seen in the bottom line in Table 6, class A's posttest averages ranged from 27 percent of the possible points in Unit IV to 42 percent in Unit III. Across all four tests the average obtained was about 33 percent of all possible points. As may be seen in the bottom line of Table 7, class B's posttest averages ranged from 9 percent of the possible points in Units I and IV to 24 percent of the possible points in Unit III. The average across all four posttests in this class was about 13 percent of all possible points.

TABLE 7

Case U7-B's Unit Pre- and Posttest Averages as Percents of the Maximum Possible Scores on Those Tests

	Unit			
Test	I	II	III	IV
Pretest	5	7	18	16
Posttest	9	10	24	9

At the end of the course when students were asked to describe the SEA strategy completely from memory, no student in either class exhibited complete knowledge of all the strategy labels and aspects of what-to-do to carry the steps out. In class A, 56 percent had obtained at least a partially functional level of knowledge, outlining the strategy and three to nine of the 18 what-to-do aspects. Of the remaining 44 percent, 33 percent indicated a basic knowledge, recalling the strategy step labels

with few if any of the what-to-do aspects. The remaining 11 percent were judged to have less than a bare minimum of knowledge of the strategy. Thus, using this task as an index, a little over one-half of the class A students exhibited at least some functional knowledge of the strategy.

In class B, 90 percent of the students were judged to have less than a minimum knowledge of the strategy. The remaining ten percent exhibited a basic knowledge, indicating the strategy steps but few if any of the what to-do-aspects. None of the students in this class evidenced even partially functional knowledge of the strategy, using this task as an index.

It is reasonable to believe that one aspect of class B directly affected their relatively lower achievement of SEA objectives as measured. The teacher was concerned that the students' low reading ability made the SEA material difficult for them to comprehend. The extent to which the low reading ability adversely affected achievement of SEA objectives is difficult to estimate, though class B's performance was consistently about 20 percent points lower than that of class A's on the posttests.

There were statistically significant ($p < .10$) correlations in class A between all five of the measures mentioned above and the students' verbal abilities, which were assessed prior to the SEA experience. However, in class B the correlation was only statistically significant with one of the measures, the Unit IV test. Thus there is evidence for a relation in one class but not the other between objectives achievement and verbal ability.

At the end of the course experience the students were also asked about their use of the SEA strategy. Considering their reports of past

use and anticipated future use, as well as their levels of knowledge on the above discussed recall question, it is estimated that about one-eighth of the class A students, but none of the class B students were sufficiently experienced, positive about future use, and knowledgeable to put some aspects of the strategy into future use.

General effects. The measures of general moral and values characteristics were administered to both classes of Case U7 on December 1 and 2, 1976, and again on June 14 and 15, 1977. There was no other class tested as a comparison group for this case. The particular effects tested were those of time of testing; in other words, the purpose of the analysis was to determine whether the two classes changed from before to after the SEA instruction.

Due to problems of absences and also of reading and following directions, an insufficient number of students in class B completed any of the measures to allow for analysis related to that class. The few class B students who completed the measures were included in analyses with class A students. Also, too few students in class A completed the pretest measure that was administered last; thus, analyses involving that measure, What Happens to Whom?, are not reported.

In the remaining analyses one multivariate analysis yielded statistically significant results, F (4,27)= 2.77, $p < .05$. This analysis involved the four measures related to the other persons theme in SEA. The pre- and posttest means and standard deviations for each of these measures and the centroids for the pre- and posttests are presented in

Table 8. The followup discriminant function analysis revealed the standarized coefficients, presented in parenthesis after the measure name, as follows: Values Survey (.96), Mach's Scale (-.51), Before You Decide...(.40), and the Friction subscale of the Learning Environments Scales (-.19). The major contributor to the effect is the Values Survey, with both Mach's Scale and Before You Decide...also being involved. Referring to the pre- and posttest means for these measures in Table 8, it may be seen that the directions of change are in agreement with the intended directions of SEA influence.

TABLE 8

Case U7 Means and Standard Deviations[a] of the General Measures Related to the Other Persons Theme in SEA

Measure	Testing	
	Pre	Post
Values Survey	0.90 (1.45)	1.94 (1.75)
Before You Decide...	1.97 (1.64)	2.45 (1.98)
Mach's Scale	89.00 (11.73)	88.43 (10.79)
Learning Environments Scale: Friction	42.74 (7.36)	41.94 (9.40)
Centroids	-3.980	-3.350

[a]Standard deviations are in parentheses.

The other multivariate and univariate analyses presented in the Data Analysis subsection of the Methods section revealed no statistically significant differences.

Other effects of SEA. Were any non-measured effects of SEA

perceived by the teacher or the students? the teacher thought that SEA could be valuable to his students. However, he was not able to say that he saw evidence of it being valuable to them.

Less directly related to the course objectives, the teacher told the field coordinator during the early part of Unit II that he was surprised that his slower class (class B) seemed to be following directions without needing to ask questions, while his generally brighter class (class A) frequently had questions before they'd begin to do the activities or exercises.

On the End-of-Course Questionnaire, 74 percent of the students in class A referred to some aspect of SEA as being useful or important personally. When they compared the usefulness or importance of SEA to their other courses, 52 percent rated the course as about the same. The remaining 44 percent were divided, with 22 percent indicating it was more useful and 22 percent less useful than other courses.

Seventy-three percent of these students in class B referred to at least one aspect of SEA as being useful or important to them personally. However, when they compared the usefulness or importance of SEA to their other courses, 41 percent rated the course as about the same as their other courses; and 38 percent rated it as more useful. The remaining 21 percent of the students rated the course as less useful than other courses.

In summary, about three-fourths of the students in both classes listed at least one aspect of SEA as being useful or important to them

personally. The modal rating of students in both classes was that the course was about the same as their other courses, but a substantial percent of students in class B rated SEA as being more valuable than their other courses.

Miscellaneous. There were two students (7 percent) in class A who answered the End-of-Course Questionnaire item related to hurt or upset by saying that their grades had been lowered by having their SEA performances entered into the grading. This aspect of their experience with SEA was, of course, a function of the way in which the teacher chose to grade, and not related to SEA itself.

Summary and Conclusions

Case U7 did not provide a good test of SEA. Class A provided a better test situation than class B, with the teacher departing from the SEA developer's intents for lesson presentation only slightly in A, but moderately in B. Also, though absences were at a rate of about ten percent per lesson in class A, they were over 20 percent in class B, and there was no regular provisions for makeups in either class. Both classes were faced in the last half of the course with class periods that were too short for lesson completion. Finally, it was probably unclear to the students in either class how they would be graded on their SEA work.

Although the teacher was generally positive about most aspects of SEA, major among the concerns he did have was the need for greater elaboration and clarification of terms and activities directions. This

concern was greater for class B, and involved almost one-tenth of class B's lessons. (The students, however, perceived the course as about right in its level of difficulty and as of about the same difficulty as or even easier than their other courses.) However, with a few reservations, he thought the SEA Teacher's Manual was quite complete, he believed that the preparation required for SEA lesson presentation was reasonable, and he valued the audio tape lesson presentations. Finally, he judged a large majority of the SEA lesson parts as posing no problems.

The students responses to aspects of SEA were mixed. The classroom observation reports indicate that class B was generally quite attentive to SEA lesson presentations, while class A was much less so. The teacher thought that Unit II was not interesting to the students in either class, primarily because the roles they were asked to play were not realistic in their life experiences; but he also pointed out that in Unit III they were not ready to involve themselves personally by using the strategy with a problem situation from their own lives. Nonetheless, about one-half of the students in each class said on the End-of-Course Questionnaire that they were glad to have had SEA and believed they learned important things in the course. The other half, on the other hand, said they were bored.

SEA's effectiveness in Case U7 is also a mixed picture. SEA was effective in increasing objectives-related achievement in class A, but was less effective with class B. The level of unit test scores was generally very low, especially in class B. This distinction between

classes became more exaggerated on a measure of strategy knowledge, with over one-half the class A students exhibiting a functional knowledge of some of the strategy processes, while no one in class B attained that level of knowledge. However, among those class A students only about 20 percent of those sufficiently knowledgeable seemed disposed to actually use the strategy. However, there was some evidence that Case U7 students (mostly those in class A) changed in a positive way in their orientations toward others, on major SEA theme.

Case U7 should probably be divided into two subcases, U7-A and U7-B, for purposes of some conclusions. Though neither subcase provided for a good test of SEA, implementation in U7-A was much better than that in U7-B. The objectives-referenced tests revealed that U7-A knew more of SEA than U7-B, with class A's levels of achievement being low to medium, while class B's was very low. Also, in agreement with test scores, the teacher believed that while both classes had some difficulty with SEA instruction, U7-B was more dramatically affected. Only on indices of student acceptance of SEA did the class differences decrease, with about half of each class liking and valuing the SEA experience. The teacher was generally positive about the course.

CASE S8: A SUBURBAN EIGHTH GRADE

This section is devoted to a report of pertinent background information, and SEA implementation, acceptance, and effectiveness results for the suburban eighth-grade case in the hands-off pilot study of SEA.

Background

In seeking an eighth-grade class in a parochial school, SEA staff made contact with a high-ranking administrator of a diocese. He forwarded the information to the Assistant Superintendent for Religious Education, who himself made further arrangements with a teacher whom he thought would be interested in SEA and the principal of that teacher's school.

The school. The school is a parochial school that includes grades one through eight. There were 260 students enrolled in the school during the 1976-77 school year, with 18 of these students enrolled in the eighth grade.

The school is located just beyond easy access to the major commuter lines. According to the teacher, who had served as acting principal of the school, the parents were primarily in blue collar factory worker occupations though there were also a number who were office workers. The teacher estimated that parents' incomes were generally below the national average. Of the 260 students, 250 were White and ten were Black. The students bring their own lunches to school consequently there is no federally sponsored lunch program, although milk was provided at a minimal charge.

The teacher stated there were no suspensions due to fighting. He noted what little fighting that occurred was between students in the lower grades. The school population was stable, with the majority of students completing all grades. The turnover rate amounted to five students per year.

The teacher. The teacher was a White man who had begun the year with ten years of teaching experience. He had taught English, social studies and religion courses to the seventh and eighth grade classes in the school for four years. He characterized his teaching style as being "contemporary with good rapport with my students and excellent class control;" he also said he used a variety of teaching techniques. He rated himself on teaching style scales presented in Appendix 1, as being (1) about equally structured and spontaneous, (2) more individual- than class-oriented, and (3) more outcome- than process-oriented.

The class. The class chosen for participation in this pilot study was the only eighth grade class at this school; i.e., all 18 eighth graders were in the class. Of these 18, one student was Black and the other 17 were White. Six were boys; twelve were girls. The class average score on the SCAT Series II, Verbal Part was 32.7, with a standard deviation of 5.52. This average is a little above the national average, standing at the 53rd percentile for individual eighth graders.

Implementation

The implementation topics refer to various aspects of how the course was administered by the teacher. The major topic here is the extent to

which the course was presented in the way intended by the SEA developer. Other implementation topics are also included because each reveals a feature of the students' contacts with SEA.

Presentation congruence. In general, the teacher presented the SEA lessons as directed in the SEA Teacher's Manual. There were only two departures that were judged by the developer to be at least moderately serious. Both occurred in Unit II, and in both cases the teacher was rushing to finish the lesson after a very lengthy class discussion had been held. The objectives to which the changed lesson parts were directly related represent about five percent of the total course objectives, which is considered by the SEA staff as having only a slight impact.

Presentation time. Due to flexibility of his schedule the teacher could present the course in time periods ranging from 45 minutes to an hour. From the teacher's reports, the average lesson lasted 43 minutes, with the shortest lasting 30 minutes and the longest lasting 74 minutes. There were six comments (four in Unit II, and one in each of the later units) regarding the length of lessons. In all of these instances the teacher felt that more than 30 minutes were needed in order to present the lesson adequately.

The teacher started the course on October 12, 1976, and completed the last lesson on April 29, 1977. Although the teacher on several occasions stated he would teach three lessons per week, he generally did not. There was no regular rate of presentation. The teacher presented

only one lesson a week nine times, two lessons per week eight times, three lessons per week three times, and once presented four lessons in a week. One separate class session was devoted to each lesson presentation.

There were no extended interruptions of lessons in Units I and III However, Unit II was interrupted once for the Thanksgiving recess and again for seven weeks between Lessons 4 and 5. This lengthy interruption was the result of a combination of the teacher's personal vacation time, the Christmas break and a period of 3 weeks when SEA wasn't taught because of disruptions in the school schedule. When the teacher resumed the course, he reviewed the previous four lessons in Unit II by replaying the tapes to refresh the students' memories, but he did not require them to repeat the activities and exercises in those lessons. A spring break of two weeks occurred between Lessons 2 and 3 in Unit IV. No review was conducted after this break.

Fit within the program. How did the teacher relate SEA to other subjects he taught? In interviews conducted early in Unit I, the teacher said he planned to integrate course concepts with social studies and religion, which he was also teaching to the class. By the end of Unit II the teacher felt SEA was a separate curriculum and that he would not be able to fully integrate SEA into social studies, or religion, because he was behind in teaching what he was required to teach in those courses. Nevertheless, the teacher felt that the concepts presented in SEA were similar to ones he was teaching in the religion course. On

only one occasion was the teacher observed to alert the students that a concept presented in SEA was related to something in another course they had recently been studying.

Student accountability procedures. How did the teacher hold students responsible for their SEA work? During the pretesting sessions the students did ask about grades in the upcoming SEA course. The teacher did not respond at this time, and there was no indication that he ever talked with them about grades for SEA work. However, he told the SEA field coordinator that he was uncertain what to do about grades. On the one hand, he thought grading their SEA work might help to keep them interested in the course. On the other hand, he believed that grading their work might detract them from seeing the immediate value of SEA to their own lives. Finally he decided that his own enthusiasm for SEA would carry the students through any potentially uninteresting parts, and, thus, he did not need to grade their SEA work.

Because he did not grade the SEA tests as he did the tests he gave in other subjects, he believed that the students' attitudes toward the SEA tests were not the same as with other tests; he thought that the students might have done better on the tests than they did if he had been grading them.

Student absences. There was an extremely low rate (on the average of less than one percent per lesson) of student absentees from the SEA lesson presentations. Initially, the teacher allowed the students who were absent to make up the missed lessons by listening to the tape. Because

he did not believe this type of review was sufficient, he began to review the missed lessons with the students over the lunch period. However, there were a few times when no makeups at all were conducted.

Acceptability

In contrast with the above topics dealing with how the course was presented, the following topics all relate to how whatever was presented as SEA was received, by the teacher and by the students.

Adequacy of the Teacher's Manual. The teacher considered the manual sufficiently well organized for the lesson presentations. Only on two occasions did the teacher view the Manual as incomplete. On both occasions the teacher felt that the explanation in the manual was inadequate.

The teacher felt the whole manual was cumbersome, but easily managed when he separated out all materials related to the unit in use.

Reasonableness of preparation time and resource requirements. The teacher never indicated that the time needed to prepare for SEA lessons or the resources needed were unreasonable. For most of the lessons the teacher listened to the tapes, viewed any included filmstrips, and read the scripts. This took from 30 to 45 minutes depending on the content of the lesson. The teacher did indicate that he would have liked to do more lessons without the audio tape, but he did not because he thought he would need more time to prepare.

Instructional quality. Did the teacher believe that the lessons provided good, or at least problem-free instruction? The teacher evaluated

46 percent of the lesson parts as especially good and an additional 49 percent of the lesson parts as presenting no problems. He said his primary basis for the quality ratings was the students' responses to the lesson parts.

In general, the teacher was pleased with the variety of activities offered in Unit I. He was not as enthusiastic about Unit II. He suggested redoing the explanation of people reading and eliminating some of the role play activities. He thought that many lessons in this unit were redundant. The teacher was impressed with Units III and IV. He said that the lessons in these units were "pretty well-organized." He felt Unit III was especially valuable for the information conveyed.

Appeal of presentation mode. What were the teacher's and students' reactions to the audio tape and visual features of the lesson presentations? The teacher conducted 75 percent of the lesson parts that had a mode option using the audio tape presentation mode. He said he would have used the teacher mode more had he felt he had sufficient time to prepare. He felt he could adapt his presentation to fit the student reaction of the moment more than was possible with the tape. He also thought that the students were less attentive and interested when he used the tape, though they generally seemed to the SEA field coordinator to be attentive to the taped lessons.

The teacher did not like either narrator's taped presentations. He felt that the second narrator talked too fast for the students to understand the directions, and that the first narrator would have been better

if he had not sounded as if he were talking down to the students. Several students also presented these dissatisfactions in a class discussion held during Unit II. The teacher indicated that the teenage voices sounded phony, and the introductory music was boring after the first few lessons. On the other hand, the teacher felt the background music was soothing.

The teacher was impressed with the filmstrips offered in Unit I. He felt they were interesting and provoked student discussions.

Classroom management problems caused by SEA. An examination of the teacher's lesson and interview reports reveals that the teacher never attributed a classroom management problem to the SEA program. However, the SEA field coordinator noted a problem among a few students who could not locate an assignment completed much earlier in the course, but the resulting confusion related to less than one percent of the course.

Difficulty. To what extent were the SEA tasks and objectives at a level of difficulty appropriate for the students in general and for students of different verbal abilities? The teacher indicated one instance in which he perceived a lesson part to be so easy as to be trivial. This amounted to much less than one percent of SEA lesson parts. He gave no indication of the course being too difficult for the students.

On the End-of-Course Questionnaire the majority of the students indicated that SEA was about right in its difficulty, although they found it easier than their other courses. Although there was some variation among responses, there are no obvious associations between their answers

here and the SCAT verbal ability scores, obtained just prior to student participation in the SEA course. However, as discussed later in the Achievement of objectives subsection of this case study report, there was evidence that verbal ability was related to performance on several of the measures of objectives achievement.

Harmlessness. The teacher did not record any instance of a harmful repercussion of a SEA lesson. On the End-of-Course Questionnaire item concerning hurt or upset caused by SEA, only two (11%) of the 18 students wrote phrases which might possibly relate to perceived harmful effects. Although the answers were difficult to interpret, they are not considered to be serious. (One wrote only "psychology of the course," while the other wrote only "Step 2, Think Up Action Ideas.")

Student interest. Did the students indicate that they were involved and interested in SEA? According to the teacher and the observer's accounts of behavior, the students were generally interested and involved with the materials for the duration of the course. The teacher evaluated 46 percent of the lesson parts presented as "especially good," based on student behavior and interest.

According to the teacher the lowest points of student interest and involvement occurred during Unit II lessons. He said that the students were either very positive or very negative during that unit, depending on their enjoyment of the role-playing activities. Both teacher and observer accounts indicate that during Units III and IV student involvement and interest were high.

On the End-of-Course Questionnaire, 72 percent of the students said they were glad they had had SEA. The reasons they gave were usually either the course's usefulness in their lives or its value to their self-understanding. Of the students who said they were not glad they'd had the course, two (11%) said it was boring, two said they didn't learn anything new, and one was discouraged by the implication that the strategy should be applied to everything.

Effectiveness

The study of the effectiveness of SEA on the students included investigations of the achievement of explicit SEA objectives and the effects on general moral and value characteristics. In addition, a variety of other outcomes was recorded and is presented under the title of "Other Effects" in the following pages.

Achievement of objectives. Students' performances on all four of the objective-referenced unit tests increased significantly from before to after their respective units of SEA instruction. Unit pre- and posttest averages are presented in Table 9 as percents of the maximum possible scores. There was on each of the unit tests at least some room for additional achievement. As may be seen in the bottom line in Table 9, the posttest scores ranged from 87 percent of the possible points in Unit III to 60 percent of the possible points in Unit IV. Across all four tests the average obtained was about three-quarters of all possible points.

TABLE 9

Case S8's Unit Pre- and Posttest Averages as Percents of the Maximum Possible Scores on Those Tests

	Unit			
Test	I	II	III	IV
Pretest	20	29	32	47
Posttest	67	75	87	60

At the end of the course when students were asked to describe the SEA strategy completely from memory, 88 percent of the students demonstrated at least a functional knowledge of the strategy, being able to recall the step names and over one-half of the what-to-do aspects of the strategy. Going beyond the functional level, 55 percent of these students gave detailed or discursive descriptions of the strategy. Thus, using this task as an index of the strategy knowledge, the majority of the students seemed to have learned the strategy quite thoroughly.

The correlation between the students' verbal abilities, which were assessed prior to the SEA experience, and strategy knowledge was .64 ($p < .01$). The correlations of test scores for Units II and IV with the verbal ability test scores were in the upper .30's, but were only marginally significant ($p < .10$) due to the small number of students involved. The correlations of the remaining two sets of scores with the verbal ability scores were much lower and did not even approach statistical significance. In summary, there is evidence for a relation in this

class between strategy knowledge and verbal ability; however, the relationship is not as definite with overall objectives attainment in general.

At the end of the course the students were also asked about their use of the SEA strategy. Considering their reports of past use and anticipated future use, as well as their levels of knowledge on the above discussed strategy recall question, it is estimated that about two-thirds of the class were sufficiently experienced, positive about future use, and knowledgeable to put some aspects of the strategy into future use.

General effects. The general measures were administered in S8 on September 29, 1976, and again on May 5, 1977. The measures were also administered in two comparison classes on approximately the same dates. Because S8 was the only eighth grade class in the school, the comparison classes had to be found in other schools. Two other schools were chosen after discussing possible testing-only sites with the diocese's Assistant Superintendent for Religious Education, who suggested the schools because he thought they were quite similar to S8 in terms of staff and student backgrounds. In both comparison classes, there was a program of moral education that differed considerably in content and mode from SEA. The following analyses were conducted by comparing S8 scores with both comparison classes together; i.e., no distinctions among comparison group scores were made on the basis of which comparison class the scores came from.

None of the multivariate or univariate analyses revealed statistically

significant results. That is, the relation between before and after test scores was not different for the S8 and comparison class groups.

With one exception, the findings above may be considered representative of all the students in the classes. However, comparisons involving the measure of breadth of consideration of others, called What Happens to Whom? and used as an index of the reflectivity theme in SEA, did not produce representative results because too few persons had sufficient time to complete this measure in the pretest sessions. Thus, the reflectivity theme of SEA was not adequately tested in Case S8.

Other effects of SEA. The teacher indicated several areas in which there were non-measured effects of SEA. In terms of the course itself, the teacher felt that the listening skills and trust level attained among class members would carry over into other courses. He noted an indication of this was that the students interacted better with each other and with students outside the class during gym and other physical education activieies. By the end of the course, the teacher believed the students would use the strategy. He also believed that the students had a better understanding of themselves because the course gave them the opportunity to look at themselves.

On the End-of-Course Questionnaire, the students were asked what SEA topics they believed were important or useful for them to know. All students gave at least one such topic. The categories of topics, each mentioned by at least 20 percent of the students, were (1) being fair, (2) thinking before acting, and (3) using the strategy. In comparing

the usefulness of SEA with that of their other courses, 67 percent said SEA was more useful, 17 percent said it was about the same, and 17 percent said SEA was less useful.

Miscellaneous

The other students and teachers in the school were aware that the eighth-grade class was doing something special. A "Do Not Disturb" sign was placed on the door during presentations to minimize disruptions. Two seventh graders once asked the SEA field coordinator if they would have the opportunity to have the course next year. On several occasions the principal inquired how the course was going.

The teacher himself hoped the diocese would adopt the program in all their schools. The diocesan Assistant Superintendent for Religious Education was interested in having the SEA teacher visit other schools and present the course to teachers within the diocese.

Summary and Conclusions

Case S8 provided a situation favorable to the testing of SEA. A diocesan administrator chose the teacher as the best teacher to work with the course, and then encouraged the teacher in SEA presentations. The teacher was enthusiastic throughout the presentations and well prepared, remaining quite close in lesson presentation to the SEA developer's intents. The class was rather small, the students seemed to respect the teacher, and there seemed to be good rapport between students and teacher The students were about average in scholastic ability and were absent very seldom. The class periods were considerably longer than

required for SEA lessons, and the pace of the usual lesson presentation seemed leisurely, often with extended, relevant discussions. Only a somewhat irregular rate of presentation, broken within SEA units two times by an extended period of no SEA, prevented the situation from being the ideal.

As presented above, the teacher's general reaction to SEA from start through finish was positive, enthusiastic. He judged practically one-half of the SEA lessons to be of especially good instructional quality and found no problems with almost all the rest. He believed there were no problems of classroom management or harm to students arising from SEA, and found less than one percent of the SEA lesson parts to be at an inappropriate difficulty level. He thought the preparation time and resource requirements for lesson presentation were reasonable. He thought the SEA Teacher's Manual was adequate, except for a few minor points. His only negative reactions were to the tone and pace of the narrators and the tone of the teenagers' voices used to model on the audio taped lessons. The students' reactions to SEA were also generally positive, with 13 of the 18 students (72%) saying they were glad they'd had the course, and two-thirds of the students saying that SEA was more personally useful than their other courses. The majority thought SEA was about right in its level of difficulty, with most of the remaining students believing it was easy.

With this class, SEA was effective in leading to a high level of performance on objectives-related test items. Most students had a

thorough knowledge of the strategy, with degree of knowledge being significantly related to verbal ability. It was estimated that about two-thirds of the class were sufficiently experienced, positive about future use, and knowledgeable to put at least some aspects of the strategy into future use.

However, the attempt in this study to find support for SEA-related changes in the more general measures of effects was not successful. In contrast, the teacher did believe that he had seen an improvement in the interactions of the students outside the class during gym and lunch time sports.

In summary, under the positive conditions provided by S8, SEA was a generally well-liked course that did improve objectives-related knowledge and skills, but did not lead to the expected changes in the particular general measures used.

CASE U8: AN URBAN EIGHTH GRADE

This section is devoted to a report of pertinent background information and SEA implementation, acceptance, and effectiveness results for the urban eighth-grade case in the hands-off pilot study of SEA.

Background

SEA staff initially contacted the Director of Social Studies for a large city school district. He reviewed the course materials, and then gave us the names of principals who he thought might be interested in having the course in their schools. SEA staff had indicated interest in students in grades seven, eight, and nine. Thus, the Director of Social Studies mentioned principals in both junior high and K-8 schools in the city. SEA staff mailed course-related information to these principals and then phoned them to follow up. This school's principal shared the information with several teachers in his school, and one of them indicated interest in using the materials with one of her classes.

The school. The school is a neighborhood public middle school containing the fifth through eighth grades. The enrollment during the latter half of the 1976-77 school year was approximately 1660, with about 430 students being in the eighth grade.

With the exception of one percent who are White, all the other students are Black. The principal said the students come basically from lower-middle class families. A large majority of the students (from 48 to 54 percent) are on the federally-funded lunch program. The turnover rate is low at the school, as the neighborhood is quite stable.

There is very little fighting and suspensions are low. This may be due to the fact that the school is set up on a house or little school concept where supervision of students is closely monitored by teachers and counselors.

The teacher. The teacher is a Black woman, who has taught junior high school students for 15 years and other grade levels for an additional 14 years. She has taught with her present colleagues for six years and was teaching social studies at the time she began presenting SEA. She characterized her teaching style as both traditional and innovative. On the teaching scales presented in Appendix 1, she characterized herself as mostly structured and class oriented but also viewed herself as spontaneous and individually oriented when needed. She rated herself as outcome- as opposed to process- oriented.

The class. The class of 35 students was one of four eighth-grade classes that the teacher taught. The teacher chose this class because they were her brightest students. All the students were Black; 20 were girls and 15 were boys. The average score on the SCAT; Series II, Verbal Part was 28.7, which is about 38th percentile in the national individual norms. The standard deviation was 6.28.

Implementation

The implementation topics refer to various aspects of how the course was administered by the teacher. The major topic here is the extent to which the course was presented in the way intended by the course developers. Other implementation topics are also included because each reveals a feature of the students' contacts with SEA.

Presentation congruence. In general the teacher's departures from the developer's intents in SEA lesson presentations were considered to have only a slight impact in relation to SEA objectives. Only two events were considered by the developer to be departures. Both occurred in Unit III, and both were the result of the habit of the teacher to replay part or all of the tape for the immediately preceding lesson before presenting the next lesson. In one of the occasions this replay was deemed to have the effect of an unduly great emphasis on a topic of minor importance. The other event was the complete omission of a lesson summary, which emphasized a rather difficult and objective-related point.

Presentation time. The teacher began her lesson presentations of SEA on January 25, 1977, and finished them on June 14, 1977. She used a 60 minute period in which to present the lessons. She used 39 class sessions to present the lessons, averaging 42 minutes per lesson. This average time does not include two occasions when the teacher repeated lessons but did not indicate presentation times on the reports. The longest lesson presented lasted 60 minutes, the shortest 30 minutes.

When the teacher initially began presenting the course, there was no regular rate of presentation due to numerous school-wide disruptions (e.g., standardized achievement tests, career assemblies, and guidance presentations). Toward the end of Unit I and thereafter the teacher presented three lessons per week. However, on one occasion in Unit III, there was a week-long break between lessons, which occurred between Lessons 1 and 2. Spring break was the only holiday which affected the rate of presentation and it occurred between Lessons 7 and 8 in Unit II.

The teacher was concerned with the time used to present six of the lessons. She felt in four instances that more time needed to be allotted for discussions that made the lessons longer than thirty minutes. The other two occasions concerned whether there was sufficient time for both the review and the test in the same class period.

Fit within the program. How did the teacher relate SEA to other subjects he or she taught? The teacher's main subject matter was history. Although the students related SEA concepts to historical topics, the teacher made no formal attempt to integrate SEA with history. However, SEA was taught in place of some social studies classes and grades given in SEA were averaged with the social studies grade on the report card.

Student accountability procedures. What procedures were used by the teacher to hold students accountable for their SEA studies? From the very beginning of the course, the teacher indicated to the students that SEA was to be regarded as a serious undertaking on which they would be graded and this grade would be averaged with their social studies grades for a mark on their report cards. The teacher said the students were graded on all of their school work. In SEA this included their performances on the unit tests, types of participation in class (e.g., one student helping another understand something in SEA and applying SEA to concepts in history or other topics being discussed), and homework.

Even though homework was not included to any great extent in the SEA course design, the teacher gave outside assignments. Those assignments

included the completion of worksheets, memorizing the strategy step names and the glossary of definitions on the SEA unit divider pages, developing role play situations, and brainstorming extra action ideas.

Students could come to review sessions after regular school hours to improve their grades. There the students would listen to tapes, do written work and other activities, and discuss content with the teacher and other students.

Student absences. There were on the average eight percent of the students absent from the lesson presentations. It was the school policy for the students to make up work they missed when absent. Therefore, after they returned to school, the students came to the teacher to ask for make-up sessions. In Unit I the absentee rate was four percent per lesson. During Unit II, so many students (13 percent absent per lesson) were out sick that the teacher began to hold regular group review sessions after regular school hours. The reviews consisted of hearing the tapes, doing written work and other activities, and discussing content with the teacher and other students. These mandatory review sessions for absent students lasted from Unit II on through Unit IV. The absentee rates in both Units III and IV were 11 percent per lesson.

Acceptability

In contrast with the above topics dealing with how the course was presented, the following topics all relate to how whatever was presented as SEA was received by the teacher and by the students.

Adequacy of the Teacher's Manual. The teacher found the SEA Teacher's

Manual informative and helpful. She felt the students had little difficulty with the content presented, because the directions in the Manual were clear and easily understood by her. In addition, she appreciated the leeway provided for in discussions and examples which allowed her to tailor the instruction to her particular students.

Reasonableness of preparation time and resource requirements. There were no instances recorded which indicated that either the preparation time or resource requirements were considered beyond reasonable bounds by the teacher.

Instructional quality. Did the teacher believe that the lessons provided good or at least problem-free classroom instruction? The teacher thought the units were sequenced in an instructionally sound fashion. She commented that when one boy was absent for a long time with a broken leg, he said after his third review session that all the SEA he'd missed seemed to fall into place for him. When at some points the presentations seemed initially repetitious, she cautioned the students to listen, and they and she found something new was being presented.

She thought Unit I went quite well. In Units II and III, she believed that the students enjoyed applying the SEA concepts. The teacher thought Unit IV went well, too, though there was some distraction because it was so close to the end of school. Most students, however, wished to continue in order to complete the course.

The teacher considered 71.8 percent of the lessons as especially good, and 20.2 percent of the lessons as resulting in no problems.

Appeal of presentation mode. What were the teacher's and students' evaluations of the audio tape and visual features of the lesson presentations? The teacher appreciated the option to use the teacher mode of presentation, even though she chose to present the lessons 93 percent of the time using the tape. Although she had used taped instruction before with her classes, she never had used it so extensively as with SEA. She believed that the students' early reactions were interest, because of the novelty. The teacher perceived that as the novelty wore off, their interest decreased for a while, only to increase somewhat again. She thought this last change came through increased appreciation of the music and the young voices doing the modeling, and through increased attentiveness required by the fast-paced presentation of the second narrator.

The teacher reported that she and her students found the filmstrips enjoyable and interesting.

Classroom management problems caused. There were no indications recorded in any of the teacher's or SEA field coordinator's accounts that the SEA classroom activities resulted in management problems for the teacher.

Difficulty. To what extend were the SEA tasks and objectives at a level of difficulty appropriate for the students in general and for students of different verbal abilities? On only one occasion did the teacher report that the majority of students encountered difficulty with the the materials. This occurred in Unit II when students were reluctant to proceed without constant supervision in applying Step 4, Judge, to their

case studies. On two other occasions, a few students needed help in understanding the directions. One occurred in planning the dramas; the other happened when very few students had difficulty distinguishing between specific and possible. In both situations, the teacher gave homework to increase understanding of the instruction. Altogether, the teacher judged between 1 and 2 percent of all SEA Lesson parts too difficult.

On the questionnaire administered after the SEA experience the students responded to the questions concerning their opinions about the difficulty of SEA. With regard to absolute difficulty, the great majority of students expressed the view that SEA was about right in difficulty. Concerning relative difficulty, most students chose either to say SEA was easier or the same as their other courses. What variation there was in judgments of absolute difficulty was inversely related to the students' verbal abilities, which were assessed prior to the start of SEA. There was some evidence for a relation between objectives achievement and verbal ability, which is discussed in the subsection of this case report called "Achievement of objectives."

Harmlessness. The teacher reported that an unequal treatment exercise in Unit I caused her some concern because the students told her it upset them. She felt that a great many students were affected by the roles they had to play. Many students who were the superior ones could not treat the others as inferiors. Also, some students who were the inferior ones had quite dominant personalities and did not like being treated as inferiors. However, the teacher felt the exercise was

worthwhile, but would in the future allow each student a chance to play both the superior and inferior person to alleviate any hurt feelings which might occur.

Only one student indicated a hurt or upset caused by SEA. This person reported that the event occurred when it seemed that he, or she, might need to reveal to others a personal value situation. As a result, he or she made up a value situation, so that the other person reading about it would not be invading his/her personal life.

Student interest level. Did students indicate they were involved and interested in SEA? The teacher rated over 70 percent of the lessons "especially good," primarily because the students evidenced involvement and interest in the course. During the first three units, there was a high degree of participation in the activities and the discussions held. Unit I was appreciated for its wide range of activities. Unit II was thoroughly enjoyed because the students functioned well in the groups and understood the concepts presented. In Unit III the students enjoyed applying what they learned. The teacher stated Unit IV also went well but the students increasingly became distracted because it was too close to the end of the school year for them to remain involved in any type of school-like activity.

On the End-of-Course Questionnaire, 81 percent of the students said they were glad they had the SEA course. The reasons they gave were either the course's usefulness to them or its value to their self-understanding. Of the students who said they were not glad they had the course,

most said it was boring. In summary, SEA was popular with these students although for several reasons some students were negative.

Effectiveness

The study of effectiveness of SEA on the students included investigations of the achievement of the explicit SEA objectives and the effects on general moral and value characteristics. In addition, a variety of other outcomes was recorded and is presented under the title of "Other Effects" on the following pages.

Achievement of objectives. Students' performances on the last three objectives-referenced unit tests increased significantly from before to after their respective units of instruction. The results from the Unit I test were not available, because the teacher had lost the completed tests. Unit pre- and posttest averages are presented in Table 10 as percents of the maximum possible scores.

TABLE 10

Case U8's Unit Pre- and Posttest Averages as Percents of the Maximum Possible Scores on Those Tests

	Unit			
Test	I	II	III	IV
Pretests	--	8	27	30
Posttests	--	44	48	42

The unit test scores for these three units were more than moderately below the maximum score possible. As may be seen in the bottom line

in Table 10, the posttest averages ranged from 48 percent of the possible points in Unit III to 42 percent of the possible points in Unit IV. Across all three tests the average obtained was 45 percent of the possible points.

At the end of the course when students were asked to describe the SEA strategy completely from memory, 64 percent of the students demonstrated at least a functional knowledge of the strategy, being able to recall the step names and at least one-half of the what-to-do aspects of the strategy. Of the remaining 36 percent, 10 percent did not have even a basic knowledge of the strategy. Thus, using this task as an index, it can be said that an overwhelming majority of the students seemed to have learned the strategy quite thoroughly with most of the students having at least a functional knowledge of the strategy and a small minority below a basic knowledge.

Correlations between performance on each of three unit measures mentioned above and the students' verbal abilities, which were assessed prior to the SEA experience, were in the .40's and .50's all of which were statistically significant ($p < .05$). However, no relation was evidenced between verbal abilities and recall of the strategy on the End-of-Course Questionnaire. In summary, there is evidence for a relation in this class between objectives achievement and verbal ability, but verbal ability was not correlated with knowledge of the strategy.

At the end of the course experience, the students also were asked about their use of the SEA strategy. Considering their reports of past

use and anticipated future use, as well as their levels of knowledge on the above discussed strategy recall question, it is estimated that about one-quarter of the class were sufficiently experienced, positive about future use, and knowledgeable enough to put aspects of the strategy into future use.

General effects. The general measures were administered in U8 on January 13 and 14, 1977, and again on June 16, 1977. On the same dates another of the teacher's eighth grade classes, the one she said was comparable, was also given the general measures. The analyses of primary interest as described below are those that compare changes from the first to second testing in the SEA class with the changes in the comparison class.

Two of the three multivariate analyses described in the Data analysis subsection of the Methods section of this report yielded statistically significant results. Only the analysis of the measures of the self component of SEA did not reveal statistically significant effects. With the analysis related to the other persons component of SEA, results were significant at the $p < .05$ level (F (4.39) = 3.18). The means, standard deviations and the centroids for the SEA and comparison classes are presented in Table 11.

100

TABLE 11

Case U8 and Its Comparison Class' Means, Standard Deviations, and Centroids on Measures Related to the Other Persons Component of SEA

Measures	Classes	
	SEA	Testing-Only
Values Survey		
Pretest	1.4 (1.29)[a]	0.9 (1.18)
Posttest	1.0 (1.48)	1.4 (1.40)
Before You Decide...		
Pretest	3.3 (2.77)	3.6 (2.43)
Posttest	4.5 (3.59)	3.1 (2.35)
Mach's Scale		
Pretest	85.9 (9.16)	89.5 (14.12)
Posttest	83.0 (11.77)	95.8 (13.16)
Learning Environments Scale: Friction		
Pretest	39.0 (9.07	41.0 (8.19)
Posttest	39.7 (7.35)	40.9 (8.06)
Centroids	.5367	-.5792

[a]Standard deviations are in parentheses.

The followup discriminant function analysis resulted in standardized discriminant function coefficients, which are presented in parentheses after their respective measures as follows: Mach's Scale (-.73) Before You Decide... (.66), Values Survey (-.16), and Learning Environment Scale: Friction (-.06). As implied by the relative values of these coefficients, the former two measures are the major contributors to the multivariate effect, while the latter two make only minor contributions.

Referring to the means for the two major contributing measures presented in Table 10, it may be seen that the directions of change are in agreement with the intended directions of SEA influence, which are to decrease Mach's Scale scores and to increase Before You Decide... scores. Thus, this effect is supportive of the claim for SEA's influence on positive orientations toward other persons.

The remaining multivariate analysis of measures related to the reflectivity component of SEA also yielded positive results, F (2,38) = 3.79, $p < .05$. Means and standard deviations for the two measures of this component and the centroids for the two classes are presented in Table 12. The followup discriminant function analysis resulted in

TABLE 12

Case U8 and Its Comparison Class' Means, Standard Deviations[a], and Centroids on Measures Related to the Reflectivity Component of SEA

Measures	Classes	
	SEA	Testing-Only
What Happens to Whom?		
Pretest	5.8 (5.51)	4.8 (3.79)
Posttest	12.1 (7.12)	6.6 (4.57)
Self-Description: Reflectivity		
Pretest	70.9 (8.81)	66.0 (8.53)
Posttest	72.9 (7.16)	69.5 (7.42)
Centroids	1.098	-.225

[a]Standard deviations are in parentheses.

standardized coefficients, presented in parentheses after their respective measures as follows: What Happens to Whom? (.99) and Self Description:

Reflectivity (-.27). The relative magnitudes imply that scores on the former measure made the major contribution to the distinction between groups revealed by the multivariate analysis. The relation among the means in Table 12 are in agreement with the intended directions of SEA influence, with the number of persons or groups listed on the What Happens to Whom? measure increasing more dramatically in the SEA class.

In summary, there was evidence of changes in two of the three general characteristics thought to be influenced by SEA. All strongly evident changes on single measures were in the direction expected (i.e., the changes on Mach's Scale, Before You Decide..., and What Happens to Whom?).

Other effects of SEA. Were any non-measured effects of SEA perceived by the teacher or the students? The teacher believed that SEA provided a valuable and rewarding experience for her students. She cited the application of terms (e.g., "brainstorming" and "role play") and the posing of the question "Is that ethical?" as evidence of use she had observed a number of times in class when students were talking among themselves. In addition, the teacher noted an increasing willingness on the part of students to share their opinions as the course progressed and increasing references to role play as a way to figure out how someone else might react.

By the end of the course, the teacher reported that the students themselves felt they really had learned something that would help them deal with problems next year in high school and in the future. They

were proud of being involved in SEA to the extent that they requested the teacher to make an announcement in the senior awards assembly that they each received a certificate for participating in the course.

On the End-of-Course Questionnaire, every student referred to some aspect of SEA as being useful or important personally. When they compared the usefulness or importance of SEA to their other courses, 65 percent said SEA was about the same as the others. Thirteen percent said it was more important; 22 percent said it was less important.

Miscellaneous

The class met in an open-space environment, where two other classes were also held. On all twelve occasions when the SEA field coordinator was present, the noise from the other classes distracted her, but didn't seem to bother the SEA teacher and her students.

Also, the teacher emphasized through her SEA assignments and lesson presentations the importance of SEA. Throughout the course she assigned lesson-related homework or assignments (e.g., to memorize the definitions of each new term in the lesson). In Unit II she began to replay parts or all of immediately preceding taped lesson before presenting the next lesson. Soon after, she began regular after-school lesson review sessions that were mandatory for those who had missed lessons from the past week.

Summary and Conclusions

Case U8 provided a very good test of SEA. The SEA lessons were presented with only slight departure from the SEA developer's intents.

The time for lesson presentation was always very much more than enough. The average percent of students absent was eight percent per lesson, but those who were absent had ample opportunity to review missed lessons. Also, the students were held accountable for the SEA work by being graded on it. Furthermore, the teacher provided much review and additional homework assignments to supplement regular SEA instruction and review.

The teacher was quite positive about SEA. She rated over 70 percent of lesson parts as being "especially good." She praised the SEA Teacher's Manual and found lesson preparation requirements to be reasonable. She found no management problems associated with SEA activities, only one occasion of student difficulty with materials, and one occasion of harm -- which she believed could be easily corrected. Finally, she appreciated and used very often the audio tape presentation of lessons.

Practically every indication of student reaction to SEA was positive. Four out of every five students said that they were glad they had the course. The teacher reported high degrees of student interest and participation through the third unit; she said that attention and interest waned somewhat during Unit IV because students were ready to leave school for the summer. Most students believed that SEA was about right in difficulty, but the students with higher verbal abilities perceived it as easy. Every student listed some aspect of SEA as being personally useful, though SEA was not rated by most students as higher in usefulness than their other courses.

The findings with regard to SEA effectiveness in U8 are mixed.

First, there was definite improvement on the objectives-referenced measures, though the level of achievement was (slightly) less than half the possible points. Also, almost two-thirds of the students demonstrated at least partially functional knowledge of the SEA strategy, though it was estimated that only about one-fourth of the students were both sufficiently positive about strategy use and knowledgeable to put at least some aspects of the strategy into use. However, the teacher noted several instances of use of course concepts and techniques, and SEA may have been effective in leading to some positive changes in less course-specific characteristics, measured by several of the general effects measures.

In conclusion, Case U8 provided a good test of SEA. It was characterized by positive teacher and student reaction to the course, and evidence for SEA's effectiveness was partially obtained.

CASE S9: A SUBURBAN NINTH GRADE

This section is devoted to a report of pertinent background information, and SEA implementation, acceptance, and effectiveness results for the suburban ninth-grade case in the hands-off pilot study of SEA.

Background

The initial contact concerning the study was with the school district's assistant superintendent of curriculum and instruction, who laid the groundwork for further contacts with administrators in a school. RBS had expressed interest in involving ninth grade students. In this district the ninth grade is in the high school, and there is only one high school in the district.

The school. The school is a public high school, including grades nine through twelve. The physical plant is new and was only in its second year of use during the 1976-77 school year. Enrollment during this school year was about 1530 students, with about 370 of these in the ninth grade. The 1976-77 school year was the first year the ninth graders had been included in the high school; though problems had been anticipated, none were realized before or during the participation in the study. There has never been much fighting in the school.

The school is located in a Philadelphia suburb. The principal described the students' families as being middle to lower middle class, and characterized the parents' employment as including many skilled craftsmen, some self-employed, and foremen. The principal believed the

community was relatively stable; most students stay throughout their high school years. The school population is practically all White. Very few students receive free lunch from the federally assisted lunch program; however, the principal pointed out that more were qualified for the lunch program, but were too pround to enroll.

The teacher. The teacher was one of several notified by the principal of the opportunity to participate in the study. The teacher is a White man with 13 years' teaching in secondary school grades. His teaching area is English. Eight of those years he has taught in the school district. He characterized his teaching style as follows: "I usually begin each year lecturing, question-and-answering, and after getting to know the students, I individualize." On teaching style rating scales presented in Appendix 1, he checked that he was (1) slightly more structured than spontaneous, (2) slightly more individual- than class-oriented, and (3) slightly more process- than outcome-oriented.

The class. The teacher chose the one of his ninth-grade English classes that he believed had the best school attitude, the best rapport with him, and the least concern that English be the only topic they considered in the class. There were 27 students in the class. All students were White. About half the students were female. The class average score on the SCAT Series II, Verbal Part was 28.1, with a standard deviation of 9.42. This class average was much lower than the national average, and was at the 29th percentile for individual ninth graders.

Just before the presentation of SEA began, two students were

transferred into this class from other English classes, after making trouble for those other teachers. The teacher said that both had caused trou- for him in this class, and he believed that one in particular had damaged his relationships with the other students and the class atmosphere in general.

Implementation

The implementation topics refer to various aspects of how the course was administered by the teacher. The major topic here is the extent to which the course was presented in the way intended by the SEA developers. Other implementation topics are also included because each reveals a feature of the students' contacts with SEA.

Presentation congruence. After examining the departures the teacher made, the developer considered two of importance. The first departure occurred in Unit II when the teacher omitted feedback from a case study exercise. The teacher stated this was because he was confused by the terms. The second departure occurred in the last lesson of the course when the teacher omitted statements in which the students were to decide what component of ethical action was missing. Considering the course as a whole, these constitute only slight departures from the developer's intents.

Presentation time. Lesson presentation was begun November 8, 1976 and was completed on February 17, 1977. During this time, the teacher presented the course in thirty-eight class sessions, usually with three lessons being taught per week. Lesson presentation was accomplished on

a schedule so that school holidays generally fell between units. Thanksgiving was between Units I and II and Christmas was between Units II and III. The heating crisis which occurred during the winter closed school between the end of Unit III and the beginning of Unit IV.

The course was presented during a 45 minute time period. The teacher reported he used an average of 33 minutes per lesson presentation. The shortest lesson was 29 minutes, while the longest was 49. The longer lessons often were the result of overall student participation in the lesson discussions and the teacher's clarification.

The teacher was concerned with the presentation time of 11 lessons, 29 percent of all the lessons. He felt that more than 30 minutes needed to be allotted to present eight of these lessons. In the three other lessons, the teacher did not feel there was enough time allotted for activities on the tape.

Fit within the teacher's program. How did the teacher relate SEA to other subjects he or she taught? The teacher taught ninth-grade English, which focused upon the study of grammar, spelling, and the short story. He saw SEA as related to their study of the short story. In particular, he stated he initiated commentaries on the fairness of short story characters' behaviors as part of the study of characterization. Some students also got involved during discussions in related aspects of characterization in that effects on others were considered. The teacher planned to assign at least some of the students to the task of writing a short story that convincingly depicted a character as being ethical.

The teacher stated he had also tried to relate the SEA strategy steps to decision points in a story. Some students seemed pleased to see this particular use of the strategy steps, while others were negative to applying concepts from SEA to their study of English.

During Unit I, a few students approached the teacher stating that they were supposed to be having English instead of SEA. They were concerned because there was an emphasis on tests at the end of the ninth grade which affect their future and they felt they wouldn't be prepared for them by having SEA. Also, they knew that their friends weren't taking the course. On an observed occasion, which occurred late in Unit IV, one student called out, "We need to do our English and read our or we'll flunk." About one-half of the class yelled out "yes" in agreement with this statement. The teacher reported that he tried to leave some time for an English lesson or review of homework after he presented each SEA lesson, though this practice did not occur sufficiently often to be observed by the SEA field coordinator.

Student accountability. What procedures were used by the teacher to hold students accountable for their SEA studies? At first, in Unit I and early in Unit II, the teacher was uncertain as to what he would do regarding grades for SEA. When asked during the first lesson by four students what he was going to do about grades, the teacher responded he would give a grade on their completion of the exercises. Toward the middle of Unit I, the teacher informed the class that grades from SEA would be integrated with their English grade for the quarter. At the end of

Unit I the students again asked if they were being graded. The teacher replied to them he would be looking at their worksheets and folders in order to give them a grade at the end of the quarter.

At the beginning of Unit II the teacher decided he would use the unit tests as a basis for grading. He felt that since the students weren't participating fully in the activities, he would need to give them grades to motivate them. Toward the middle of Unit II, the teacher told the students they would be receiving a grade for all work done in conjunction with the course. At the beginning of Unit III, the teacher collected their work and reviewed it in terms of giving them a grade.

The teacher gave grades for unit posttest performances from Unit II onward. The grades on the tests were combined with grades on the English tests to determine marks for the marking period reports. The teacher said that several students received higher English grades because the SEA results were added in.

The teacher believed that the students tried as hard on SEA unit tests as they did on their regular English tests. However, they felt more pressured by the SEA tests because those tests were longer than their regular English tests.

Student absences. The teacher did not confront the problem of absentees to any great extent because of a high attendance rate in his classes, an average of less than two percent absent per lesson. When a student was absent the teacher did not have the student review the lesson. However, the student did complete all worksheets from the missed

lessons, and the teacher tried to explain enough during the following lessons so there would be no confusion.

Acceptability

In contrast with the above topics dealing with how the course was presented, the following topics all relate to how whatever was presented as SEA was received by the teacher and by the students.

Adequacy of the Teacher's Manual. The teacher thought that the SEA Teacher's Manual was adequate, though he was at times confused by so much to look through for each lesson. At times he had to read all the mode option descriptions, because these were references from one mode description to an example or something else covered in another mode description. He believed that the script was most helpful in obtaining a complete overview of the lesson. During lesson presentations he was annoyed by having to page back and forth in the manual to refresh his memory of what he was to do. He therefore made outlines of what he had to present and carried those with him around the class as he presented the lesson.

Reasonableness of preparation time and resource requirements. The teacher felt the preparation time and resources required for the majority of the SEA lesson presentations were within reasonable bounds. However, for 13 percent of the lessons the teacher reported that it would take more than the usual time to prepare for a 45 minute class.

He said he spent up to two hours preparing for most of the lessons in Unit II and felt that someone teaching other courses would not be able to spend that much time on one lesson.

Instructional quality. Did the teacher believe that the lessons provided good, or at least problem-free instruction? The teacher believed that 10 percent of the lessons provided especially good instruction and 75 percent of the lessons were problem-free. He liked the variety of activities and presentation shifts in Units I, III and IV.

He felt the biggest instructional problems encountered were in Unit II. The teacher was "annoyed" at the unit's group work, which he didn't use in other courses because he didn't find it effective. He felt that SEA's assumption that the students could hold discussions and make decisions in a group was not valid. A further problem with Unit II was the students' aversions for performing dramas in front of other students.

The teacher also felt that homework or outside class assignments should be included in the course.

Appeal of presentation mode. What were the teacher's and students' evaluations of the audio tape and visual features of the lesson presentations? The teacher liked the tapes in general. He used the tapes for 94 percent of the tape-teacher instruction options. He believed the taped lesson was often more efficient in presenting the lesson than he would have been. However, the students seemed to have a hard time attending to instruction by tape, because they looked to the teacher for instruction.

The teacher was particularly impressed by the quality of the filmstrips. He felt they were well-done and could be used in teaching both adults and children.

Classroom management problems caused. In general, the teacher reported that the SEA classroom activities did not result in classroom management problems. However, the teacher had difficulty in organizing the group activities in Unit II into a manageable classroom situation. During observed lessons, there was much in-group talking that interfered with the following of directions and there was overt resistance to role-playing. It is estimated that these problems related to 7 to 10 percent of the SEA objectives.

Difficulty. To what extent were the SEA tasks and objectives at a level of difficulty appropriate for the students in general and for students of different verbal abilities? The teacher felt that the most difficult aspect of SEA for his students was their inability to follow directions presented on tape because they looked to him for instruction. The SEA field coordinator noted in her reports that students repeatedly asked for clarification of directions, which was provided by the teacher.

The modal responses of the students indicate that SEA was considered hard, harder than most of the other courses they were taking. However, no single category on either the absolute or the relative scale was chosen by a majority of students; in fact, the figures indicate a wide difference of opinions among students. These differences of opinion were related significantly ($p < .05$) to the students' verbal abilities as assessed before SEA instruction, with judgment of difficulty increasing with decrease in verbal ability. Also, there was evidence for a relation between objectives achievement and verbal ability with the correlation being statistically significant ($p < .05$) between verbal ability scores and scores on each of the four unit tests.

Harmlessness. The teacher reported only one incident occurring which might be considered harmful to the students. This occurred during Unit II when a student was upset because he did not want to play a part in a role play enactment presented in front of the class. He threatened to go to the guidance office and ask for a transfer from the class, but did not.

When asked at the end of the course if there was anything in SEA that hurt or upset them, 19 percent of the students indicated a concern for the course's leading to an invasion of privacy and one student (4%) was upset when role taking the position of an SEA example character who had no friends.

In summary, about one-fifth of the students were upset about revealing their own values and problems, and another student was upset by considering an unpleasant condition during role taking.

Student interest level. Did students indicate they were involved and interested in SEA? The teacher noted student involvement and enjoyment during several sections of lessons in Units I and III. He also reported that Unit IV went smoothly, perhaps because the students knew the strategy. He reported that the students were not able to handle Unit II; he believed that the students were unable to participate in group discussions among themselves and most unwilling to perform the etho-dramas in front of the class.

The SEA field coordinator reported that the two lessons observed in Unit I and the three observed in Unit III the students seem involved in

the lessons and displayed on-task behavior. In all three Unit II lessons observed, there were a lot of noise and an almost complete lack of attention on the part of the students, with the teacher's request for quiet and attention being virtually ignored. Small and large numbers of students were involved in overt negative responses in every lesson observed in Unit IV; several students told the observer they would be glad when they finished the course.

Almost 70 percent of the students recorded on the End-of-Course Questionnaire that they were not glad they had the SEA course; the majority of these students said the course was boring. On the other hand, about 10 percent said they were glad they had the course because they got out of doing their regular class work, which they felt was boring. The remaining 20 percent indicated they were glad to have had the course, because it helped them with their problems.

Effectiveness

The study of the effectiveness of SEA on the students included investigations of the achievement of the explicit SEA objectives and the effects on general moral and value characteristics. In addition, a variety of other outcomes was recorded as is presented under the title of "Other Effects" on the following pages.

Achievement of objectives. Students' performance on the four objectives-referenced unit tests increased significantly from before to after their respective units of SEA instruction. In Table 13 the unit pre- and posttest averages are presented as percents of the maximum

possible scores on those tests. For all four units the unit test scores were below the maximum score possible. As may be seen on the bottom line in Table 13, the posttest averages ranged from 33 percent of the possible points in Unit II to 48 percent of the possible points in Unit III. Across all four tests the average obtained was about 38 percent of all possible points.

TABLE 13

Case S9's Unit Pre- and Posttest Averages as Percents of the Maximum Possible Scores on Those Tests

	Unit			
Test	I	II	III	IV
Pretest	8	5	13	13
Posttest	38	33	48	36

At the end of the course when students were asked to describe the SEA strategy completely from memory, 32 percent listed so few aspects that they were judged to have less than a bare minimum of knowledge of the strategy. An additional 32 percent were judged to be at a level of basic knowledge only -- just strategy step labels recalled, with few if any aspects of what to do to carry out the steps labeled. Fourteen percent more listed the strategy plus four to five of the what-to-do aspects, and the remaining 18 percent, in addition to outlining the strategy indicated more than one-half of the what-to-do aspects. Thus, using this task as an index, about one-third of the students exhibited at least some functional knowledge of the strategy.

There were statistically significant ($p < .05$) correlations between performance on each of four unit posttests and the students' verbal abilities, which were assessed prior to the SEA experience. The correlation with verbal abilities was not significant for the strategy recall question. Thus, there was evidence of a relation in this class between objectives achievement and verbal ability.

At the end of the course experience, the students were also asked about their use of the SEA strategy. Considering their reports of past use and anticipated future use, as well as their levels of knowledge on the above discussed strategy recall question, it is estimated that about one-third of the class was sufficiently experienced, positive about future use, and knowledgeable to put at least some aspects of the strategy into future use.

General effects. The general measures were administered in S9 on October 21 and 26, 1976, and again on February 24 and 28, 1977. The measures were also administered in another ninth-grade class in the same school on dates within three days of the above dates. The following analyses were comparisons of S9 and this other ninth grade class, which received no special instruction on the topics presented by SEA.

The multivariate analyses relevant to changes in both the self and the other persons components of ethical action as presented in SEA, revealed no statistically significant differential changes between S9 and its comparison class. However, of the four measures of the other persons component of SEA, the Values Survey did reveal a statistically

significant differential change, $F(1, 36) = 4.13$, $p < .05$. The SEA class went from 2.2 prosocial values chosen on the pretest to 1.5 chosen on the posttest, while the testing-only class moved from 1.2 to 1.5, respectively. Thus, the direction of change on this measure is opposed to that which was expected, but the initial differences between the classes confound the interpretation of the effect. Of the general other persons aspect SEA was thought to promote, there was no support in Case S9.

The multivariate analysis related to the reflectivity component of SEA yielded a significant differential change value, $F(2, 32) = 4.00$, $p < .05$. Relevant means, standard deviations, and centroids are presented in Table 14. The standardized discriminant function coefficients for the two measures were .72 for What Happens to Whom? and -.61 for Self-Description: Reflectivity. Because the magnitude of the coefficients are not greatly different from one another, it may be said that both measures contribute similarly to the multivariate effect. Reference to the means in Table 14 does reveal, however, that while the changes in What Happens to Whom? scores are in the direction of desired SEA influence, the changes in the Self-Description: Reflectivity scores are opposite from that intended. Thus, the evidence here was only partially supportive of the effectiveness of SEA.

In summary, the analyses of general effects lent only slight support to the general changes considered to be related to SEA. Scores on one general measure, What Happens to Whom?, increased more in the SEA class than in the test-only comparison class; the change is in support

of the intended SEA effects. Though statistically significant, the changes on two other measures, the Values Survey and the Self-Description: Reflectivity, were in a direction opposite to that expected.

TABLE 14

Case S9 and Its Comparison Class Means and Standard Deviations[a] of the Measures Related to the Reflectivity Component of SEA

Measure	Classes	
	SEA	Test Only
What Happens to Whom?		
Pretest	9.9 (3.61)	11.6 (3.37)
Posttest	14.6 (7.41)	10.8 (6.44)
Self-Description: Reflectivity		
Pretest	69.9 (8.66)	62.3 (10.25)
Posttest	64.9 (10.06)	64.4 (6.55)
Centroids	1.098	-.225

[a]Standard deviations are in parentheses

Other effects of SEA. The teacher felt his own decisions and behavior were affected, especially with regard to acting according to his own values. The teacher believed that the course would be valuable to his students in helping them to think things out. However, he had seen no instance where this was so. In one particular case of a problem student, the teacher was unable to use the course concepts to convey to the student what the teacher saw as the problem with the student's behavior. Even so the teacher believed that the strategy is emphasized so much that there could not help but be an appropriate effect.

Most of the students indicated on the End-of-Course Questionnaire that they did not consider SEA personally useful. While 77 percent of the students referred to some content relevant aspect of SEA as being useful or important to them, 65 percent of the students rated the course as being less useful than their other courses and only 8 percent saw SEA as more useful.

Summary and Conclusions

Case S9 provided a generally good test of SEA. The teacher varied only slightly from the developer's intents for lesson presentations. The time period available for SEA lessons was usually quite adequate. After the first unit, tests were graded, and the students seemed serious about their test performances. Absences were few, and a coverage of at least the essentials of missed SEA lessons was arranged. However, the teacher did believe that one of the students in the class was quite disruptive to most of the class meetings.

The teacher's view of SEA was generally positive, with some salient negative points as well. The large proportion of lessons were considered either problem-free or especially good. His major problems were with Unit II group activities and dramas, which posed classroom management problems. Only at those times did he think that the SEA lessons required an unreasonably long preparation time. He himself believed that the taped SEA lessons presented instruction very efficiently, but his students seemed throughout the course to be unable to attend to directions presented by the tape.

The reactions of most students by the beginning of Unit IV were negative. The majority believed the course was boring, too difficult, and less useful than their other courses. Before the fourth unit, the teacher and the SEA field coordinator had seen fewer signs of negative reaction to the course. However, as introduced above, there were problems in doing the group work and reluctance in producing the dramas in Unit II.

Although the SEA lessons were effective in increasing objectives-referenced achievement, neither that achievement nor the strategy knowledge and use orientation of the students revealed more than moderate levels of objectives achievement. There were statistically significant changes in scores on three of the general measures, though only one was in the direction implied by SEA themes. Finally, while the teacher did believe that the students would use aspects of the course, he said that he could offer no evidence for his belief.

In conclusion, Case S9 is considered to have provided a good test of SEA. The study of S9 revealed a generally positive teacher reaction, an increasingly negative student reaction from earlier to later in the course, and a low to moderate level of SEA effectiveness.

CASE U9: AN URBAN NINTH GRADE

This section is devoted to a report of pertinent background information and implementation, acceptance, and effectiveness results for the urban ninth-grade case in the hands-off pilot study of SEA.

Background

The SEA staff initially contacted the Director of Social Studies for a large city school district. He conducted a favorable review of the course materials, and then indicated the names of principals who he thought might be interested in having the course in their schools. Because it had been indicated that the target population was students in grades seven, eight, and nine, he mentioned principals in both junior high and K-8 schools in the city. SEA staff then mailed course-related information to these principals and phoned and visited them to follow up. This school's principal was one who expressed interest in hearing more about SEA.

The school. The school is located in a large urban area in a neighborhood public junior high school for seventh, eighth, and ninth graders. The enrollment during the 1976-77 school year was approximately 1,450, with about 380 students being in the ninth grade.

Almost all the students are Black; a few have Spanish surnames. The principal said that many of the families are on welfare, with most others being blue-collar workers. The school qualifies for Title I Program monies and the large majority of students are on the federally

funded school lunch program. However, the turnover rate is low at the school; most students go there through all three grades.

There is a problem with fighting at the school, though the principal said that it is not a major preoccupation. However, adult males with serious demeanors do monitor the halls; and though the principal was uncertain about the exact frequency of suspensions, the teacher said the suspensions for fighting were used quite often.

The teacher. The teacher is one of four teaching in a special program set up for no more than 40 eighth- and 40 ninth-grade students who were either not easily managed in the normal classrooms or otherwise could not cope with normal classroom pace and relations. The principal believed that this special program would be the only place to fit SEA in her school at that time of the school year (i.e., in January).

The teacher is a Black man, who has taught junior high school students for 17 years, all of which have been spent at this school. He taught all the basic subjects -- English, mathematics, social studies, and science -- to the ninth grade students in the special attention classes. He had also taught three years in the army. He characterized his teaching style as "active, very much involved with the students." On the teaching style scales presented in Appendix 1, he rated himself as (1) much more structured than spontaneous, (2) slightly more individual- than class-oriented, and (3) slightly more process- than outcome-oriented.

The class. This class of 18 students was chosen from the 35 ninth

graders in the school's special attention program, as being the ones most likely to be present in class often enough to be sufficiently exposed to the course. All students were Black; seven were girls and 11 were boys. The average score on the SCAT Series II, Verbal part was 13.0 with a standard deviation of 6.31. The class average was extremely far below the national average, being at the fourth percentile for individual ninth graders.

Implementation

The implementation topics refer to various aspects of how the course was administered by the teacher. The major topic here is the extent to which the course was presented in the way intended by the course developer. Other implementation topics are also included because each reveals a feature of the students' contacts with SEA.

Presentation congruence. The teacher presented the SEA lessons in a way that departed considerably from the developer's intents as described in the SEA Teacher's Manual. Approximately one-half of the course was changed and presented in a way not congruent with the developer's intents.

Presentation of Unit II lessons was extensively modified mostly by the teacher's introduction of his own case studies without the strategy relatedness provided in the Manual. The teacher developed the new case studies in order to provide characters and situations more realistic to his group of students. Making the content more relevant to his students was also the reason for a distorting modification of a Unit I lesson.

In Unit III there was an omission of the critical point of a lesson, possibly due to time pressure and/or belief that the point was too difficult for his students.

Although the teacher presented the course information in Unit IV, the students did not apply this information to their own use of the strategy and the teacher did not pressure them to do so. This circumstance developed after the teacher, not realizing there was a fourth SEA unit, told students that the third unit was the last.

Presentation time. The SEA course was started in mid-February and continued through June 1 in this school. Thirty-eight class sessions were used to present the 38 SEA lessons. The course was presented three days per week, usually in the morning. With the exception of spring break which lasted for one week and occurred between Lessons 10 and 11 in Unit II, there were no extended interruptions of the lessons.

From the teacher's reports the average lesson lasted 44 minutes, with the shortest lasting 35 minutes and the longest lasting 65 minutes. There were many comments throughout the course by the teacher to the effect that the time recommendations for lessons would have made the presentations too rapid for the type of students he had in this class. He chose to use a couple of 45 minute periods and one 50 minute period each week for his presentation of the SEA lessons.

Fit within the teacher's program. How did the teacher relate SEA to other subjects he or she taught? The teacher teaches all the basic subjects -- English, math, social studies, and science -- to the special

attention program students who were in the SEA class. Although he took time for SEA from the social studies and English parts of the program, he taught SEA as a separate course, not attempting to integrate it with any of the other subjects. As mentioned below, the teacher included SEA grades in figuring the grades for the Work Habits section of the report card.

Student accountability procedures. What procedures were used by the teacher to hold students accountable for their SEA studies? The teacher used test performances ("especially the first two") and classroom participation as bases for grading the students. The teacher said that he told the students that he would be using these grades to determine partially how to grade them on the Work Habits section of the report card. He believed that the students were concerned about their grades from SEA and took the SEA tests very seriously.

The teacher reported that the students viewed SEA as a "test" because of the worksheets, tape, and kind of controlled discipline which forced them to be quiet. The teacher said that this attitude prevailed for the duration of the course and that each time the students took a unit test this attitude was reinforced.

Student absences. The teacher's record indicates that on the average 33 percent of the students were absent from SEA lesson presentations. During Unit I the rate was 36 percent absent. For Unit II it dropped to 29 percent. Then it was 32 percent in Unit III, and 34 percent in Unit IV. The SEA field coordinator's record of attendance differs from

the teacher's, indicating that the teacher may be somewhat conservative; the difference is three percent, making the average absences 36 percent for the total course.

To provide for a review of missed lessons, the teacher said he repeated lessons on one day each week, during Unit I. However, he discontinued these thereafter, because he found that one-third to one-half of the students were either missing class to avoid Unit II of SEA or using Unit II SEA lessons as a reason for missing class sessions. Thus, he believed that the repeated lessons would be avoided also.

Acceptability

In contrast with the above topics dealing with how the course was presented, the following topics all relate to how whatever was presented as SEA was received by the teacher and by the students.

Adequacy of the Teacher's Manual. The teacher thought the manual was very good, being one of the best he'd seen in all his years of teaching. He said that it was easy for him to use and was quite complete, with straightforward directions that allowed him the opportunity to translate the SEA material into the students' experience.

Reasonableness of preparation time and resource requirements. The teacher did not report any instances in which the preparation time and resource requirements for SEA were not within reasonable bounds.

Instructional quality. Did the teacher believe that the SEA lessons provided good,or at least problem-free instruction? The teacher actually rated about two percent of the lesson part as "especially good,"

and almost all the rest as having "no problems." However, upon considering all comments made by the teacher about the lessons, 15 percent of the teacher's ratings of no problems were revised. Specifically, when the teacher commented elsewhere about problems of a given lesson part, the rating was changed from "no problem" to whatever type problem was referred to. After these revisions were made, the average was 80 percent problem-free and 2 percent especially good. Another qualification to these figures is that the teacher claimed and the SEA field coordinator reported very little involvement of the students in Unit IV's eight leslessons (as discussed later in the Student interest subsection), so that the percentages given above include ratings only for 30 SEA lessons through Unit III. Finally, as discussed in the presentation congruence subsection of this Case U9 report, there were marked modifications from the content of the lessons, so that the teacher's judgments of problems might have been increased had he been rating the SEA lessons without the modifications he made in them.

The teacher felt that Unit I was interesting because of the variety of activities that evoked students' interest. The filmstrips were particularly involving. However, in subsequent units he believed he had to relate the course content more directly to the students' lives because what was presented was viewed as too White, middle-class, and, in general, irrelevant to his students. The teacher recommended that the course provide characters with whom the students could identify and who would be utilized throughout the course.

The teacher believed that the delay in introducing the role of the strategy in relationship to other SEA content until late in Unit I also confused the students. He thought the strategy should be introduced much earlier and more time be spent on definition and elaboration of important strategy-related terms.

Finally, as mentioned previously, the teacher was concerned that usually the time allowed in the taped presentation for students to think and do the exercises was insufficient.

Appeal of presentation mode. What were the teacher's and students' evaluations of the audio tape and visual features of the lesson presentations? The teacher said he liked having the taped lessons. When the manual provided for an option in using the tape, the teacher used the taped lesson in 93 percent of the options. One reason he gave for the value of the tape was that he did not have to remember the amount of detail to present the lesson by himself. Also, he was able to give more individual student attention; he thought he might use the tape less if his class were brighter and not in as much need of individual help.

The students complained that there was not enough time to follow directions given on the tape; consequently the teacher had to turn the tape on and off in order to allow for the additional time for students to complete the tasks presented.

The teacher believed that the second narrator talked too fast and seemed to be automatically reading from the script. The first narrator was all right, speaking at an appropriate rate and directly to the students, with the right intonation.

The teacher could not form an opinion about the value of the children's voices, used for modeling purposes, because the content of what they said was so foreign to his students that it was rejected.

Although at first the students laughed at the music, the teacher thought that later it became a symbol of their special status. In fact, they would stop talking and attend to the instruction as soon as he turned on the tape and the music began.

The teacher commented many times during the presentation of SEA that he was disappointed SEA did not make more use of the filmstrips and cartoon type illustrations. He reported that the students became particularly involved in class discussions after a filmstrip had been viewed; he reported that a filmstrip used late in Unit IV dramatically changed the classroom atmosphere from neutral and apathetic to positive and involved.

Classroom management problems caused by SEA. The only classroom management problems reported by the teacher occurred in Unit II. First, none of the students wanted to be the recorder during group discussions. This reluctance to record seems to be another manifestation of these students' distaste for writing, as reported by the teacher. As a management problem, the disruption caused seems to be limited to about 20 percent of one lesson.

Difficulty. To what extent were the SEA tasks and objectives at a level of difficulty appropriate for the students in general and for students of different verbal abilities? From the beginning of the course, the teacher viewed various components as too difficult for his students.

Fourteen percent of the lesson parts were considered to be too difficult. He felt that the terminology and multiplicity of concepts in single lessons were more appropriate for middle-class, white suburbanites than for urban poor non-white youth. For example, to these students references to a case involved going to court, not as used in Unit II as a presentation of a character's value problem activities. Also, the teacher believed that his students were not generally able to imagine the "abstract" situations used in SEA. And, even more directly related to SEA objectives, he believed that the students never were able to relate the strategy to the content presented.

The teacher felt that the pace of instruction on the tape was too rapid, further complicating matters for what he described as "emotionally disturbed underachievers." In addition, the teacher believed that the writing load in SEA was difficult for his students to handle; he stated they can discuss topics orally very well but encounter difficulty in translating these thoughts to paper. When asked if he would be interested in teaching SEA again, the teacher indicated that he would, especially with an "academic" class.

On the questionnaire given at the end of the course, most of the students believed SEA was either hard or about right in difficulty, while saying it was either about the same or harder than other courses. Their perceptions of absolute difficulty were not related to their verbal ability scores, obtained prior to the SEA experience. And though performance on the objectives-referenced measures were not significantly

related to verbal ability scores, the correlations between these scores were moderate, as reported later in the subsection on achievement of objectives in this Case U9 report.

Harmlessness. In response to a question concerning any hurt or upset caused by SEA, no student mentioned anything relatable to invasion of privacy or being offended. However, 24 percent of the students mentioned missing their regular classes and six percent (one student) said that SEA was "too complicated." In summary, the main harm perceived by the students was missing their regular classes.

In addition, the teacher felt that teaching the students not to cheat as he perceived was presented by example in two SEA lessons, was unfair. He felt this was unfair because not cheating is foreign to these particular students' lifestyles.

Student interest. Did students indicate they were involved and interested in SEA? From the beginning of the course, the students did not know quite how to respond. They were leery about participating, not trusting the White evaluator and not knowing what the information he was collecting was to be used for. From about the middle of Unit I the students expressed the opinion that the SEA program in total was a "test." The teacher felt this was due to SEA's controlled format which forced them to be quiet, as well as the tests and worksheets used. This impression lasted for the duration of the course.

At times, especially when they didn't understand the concepts, the students became restless, talking among themselves, drawing pictures,

and in general, not paying attention. On the other hand, at other times the students became particularly involved with the course. These latter times occurred during the viewing of filmstrips and discussions which involved incidents from their daily experiences, such as fighting or stealing. However, the teacher believed that in general the students did not view the strategy or program content as something they could apply to their problems.

It was the teacher's impression that in general the students were involved in Unit I. However, they strongly rejected Unit II, probably because the situations and actions presented were silly and/or foreign to them. He thought that the personal application in Unit III was pretty much lost on his students because they would not present anything about their personal lives that might be seen or heard by others. And Unit IV was never accepted, because the students were ready to stop SEA after Unit III. They felt the teacher lied to them because he himself had not realized there were four units, and had told them that Unit III was the last one. Therefore during this unit the students just bided their time, listening but not becoming involved in the activities presented.

However, on the End-of-Course Questionnaire 69 percent of the students said they were glad they had the SEA course. The main reasons given were that they learned something new (30%) and that they learned something that was useful (19%). Of those who said they weren't glad, all except one indicated that SEA was boring. The apparent contrast of these students' reports and those of the teacher and the SEA field

coordinator may diminish if one interprets the students repors to be primarily a function of their pride in having the special status afforded by SEA study participation (as described later in the Other effects subsection) rather than enjoyment of SEA itself.

Effectiveness

The study of the effectiveness of SEA on the students included investigations of the achievement of the explicit SEA objectives and the effects on general moral and value characteristics. In addition, a variety of other outcomes was recorded and is presented under the title of "Other effects" in the following pages.

Achievement of objectives. Students' performances on each of the first three objectives-referenced unit tests increased significantly from before to after their respective units of SEA instruction. For the fourth unit test, the increase was marginally significant. Unit pre- and posttest averages are presented in Table 15 as percents of the maximum possible scores.

TABLE 15

Case U9's Unit Pre- and Posttest Averages as Percents of the Maximum Possible Scores on Those Tests

	Unit			
Test	I	II	III	IV
Pretest	8	6	2	9
Posttest	20	8	34	16

For all four units the posttest scores were dramatically below the maximum score possible. As may be seen in the bottom line in Table 15, the posttest averages ranged from 8 percent of the possible points in Unit II to 34 percent of the possible points in Unit III. Across all four tests the average obtained was about one-fifth of the possible points.

At the end of the program when students were asked to describe the SEA strategy completely from memory, 44 percent listed so few aspects that they were judged to have less than a bare minimum of knowledge of the strategy. An additional 25 percent were judged to be at a level of basic knowledge only -- just strategy step labels recalled, with few if any aspects of what to do to carry out the strategy step labels. Nineteen percent more listed up to one half of the what-to-do aspects of the strategy, and the remaining 12 percent listed from one-half to all the what-to-do aspects. Thus, using this task as an index, a majority of the students had at least a rudimentary knowledge of the strategy, but only 12 percent knew at least a majority of the strategy activities.

Correlations between performance on each of three of the five measures mentioned above and the students' verbal abilities, which were assessed prior to the SEA experience, were in the upper .40's and lower .50's, but were only marginally significant ($p < .10$) due to the small number of students involved. The correlations of the other two sets of test scores -- for Unit I and II -- with the verbal ability test scores were much lower and did not approach statistical significance at any

respected level. In summary, there is some evidence for a relation in this class between objectives achievement and verbal ability, though the evidence is not strong and does not include all SEA objectives.

Also at the end of the program the students were asked about their use of the SEA strategy. Considering their reports of past use and anticipated future use, as well as their levels of knowledge on the above discussed strategy recall question, it is estimated that about one-fourth of the class was sufficiently experienced, positive about future use, and knowledgeable to put at least some aspects of the strategy into future use.

Two aspects of this class directly affected their achievement of SEA objectives as measured. The first is the high absentee rate. Absences from SEA lesson presentations were especially critical after Unit I, because the teacher had no makeup or added help procedures. The second aspect was brought up with SEA staff by the teacher several times. He was concerned that the students would not be able to reveal fully their knowledge in their written answers on the test. The tests were more dissimilar from SEA lessons for this class than for other SEA classes, because this class' teacher had classroom discussions at many points where written exercises were called for by the SEA Teacher's Manual. The extent to which these two added considerations adversely affected achievement of SEA objectives is difficult to estimate. However, both imply that the findings presented in the preceding paragraphs are probably a conservative estimate of the achievement to be expected under improved

conditions, including a makeup procedure and more use of the intended written exercises during lesson presentations.

General effects. There was no comparison class of students for Case U9. Therefore, all analyses conducted were solely for changes from before to after the SEA program experience.

None of the three multivariate analyses revealed significant changes. In addition, the number of students involved in each test was no greater than one-third of the class, due to both the students' difficulties in responding completely to the measures and the high rate of absentees. And, though more students' scores were included in most of the univariate analyses, results with those measures, too, were not statistically significant.

Other effects of SEA. The teacher believed that the students developed over the school year and SEA probably contributed to that development. This was evidenced on various occasions by students sticking by their own opinions even when the class was against them and by the students examining their usual loyalty to the underdog, if that person had committed a murder. In addition, even though the teacher felt that teaching students not to cheat was unfair, because of the differences in their life styles, SEA started the students thinking that cheating as a way of life is not good. The teacher also said that the students discussed concepts such as fair more freely after examining their experience in an unequal treatment exercise in one lesson.

The teacher thought most of the students derived a pride from being

in the SEA course, since they were the only ones in their school involved. When they received their SEA certificates, they asked the teacher why he hadn't presented them at the school-wide graduation ceremonies. One student who was absent when the certificates were awarded and who had made several negative comments about SEA earlier in the year made a special trip to school to pick hers up.

Also, when asked in the final interview what were "particularly pleasing features" of SEA, the teacher said that the most pleasing feature was the degree of participation in and concentration on SEA not evidenced in the other courses. He said it was gratifying to see the intellectually slow and generally rejected students try to learn.

The students' reaction to the course was measured on the End-of-Course Questionnaire by whether they listed SEA content-related topics as being useful and how they compared the usefulness of SEA with that of their other courses. Eighty-eight percent of the students listed at least one such SEA content-related topic as being useful. The categories of those topics mentioned by more than 20 percent of the students were (1) use of the SEA strategy, (2) think before acting about consequences on oneself and others, and (3) respect for other persons. In comparing the usefulness of SEA with that of their other courses, 62 percent said SEA was more useful, 31 percent said it was about the same and 6 percent said SEA was less useful.

Summary and Conclusions

Case U9 posed a challenge for SEA. In an inner-city type school

with much interpersonal conflict and fighting, the class involved in SEA was a special one for students who were more difficult to manage than the regular students. Also, the tested verbal ability of the students in U9 was extremely low.

Perhaps closely related to these features of the setting is the fact the teacher presented SEA in a way that departed considerably from the developer's intents. His comments on most of the modifications indicate that the changes were meant to make SEA more realistic, interesting, and intellectually available to his particular students. While his modifications may have made his own and his students' evaluations of SEA more positive than if the changes were not made, the changes also resulted in considerable departure from the SEA objectives. Thus, Case U9 did not pose a good test of SEA.

The study of Case U9 does, however, indicate several possible major limitations to the appropriate target population for the version of SEA studied. First, a significant proportion of SEA may have been conceptually beyond these students. Secondly, the example situations and characters were often considered foreign to the experiences of the students. And, finally, regarding the sequenced lesson aspect of SEA, the high rate of absences would result in a heavy load on the teachers who try to arrange for makeup work.

While the teacher's judgment of the program was heavily influenced by his view of its inappropriateness for the special class students in Case U9, he saw some positive aspects of SEA itself, including the best

teacher's manual he'd ever seen. He said he would especially like to teach SEA to one of the "academic" classes in his school.

The students' responses to SEA were mixed, and probably were more functions of being in a study than of SEA itself. On the one hand, many students were suspicious and referred to all aspects of SEA as a "test," perhaps because of the controlled pacing of activities and use of worksheets, in addition to the general measures and unit tests used and the knowledge that they were involved in a study. On the other hand, there were several indications that many were proud of the special status they believed was attached to having been chosen to participate in the study. Some very positive aspects of the students' responses to SEA itself were their interest in the filmstrips and their greater degree of effort in SEA than in their other courses.

One aspect of the greater degree of effort that the teacher reported was that the students did take the SEA unit tests seriously. And, with the exception of the last unit test, the students did exhibit definite improvement in objectives-referenced performance from before to after relevant SEA instruction. However, for the many reasons presented above and perhaps others, the students' level of objectives achievement was never very high, averaging about 20 percent per student across the tests. With regard to the general measures, there were insufficient numbers of students taking both pre- and posttests to generalize about the whole class. However, none of the statistical tests conducted revealed significant changes.

In conclusion, because of the considerable departure from the developer's intents, the SEA implementation in Case U9 did not allow for a clear test of either SEA's effectiveness in objectives attainment or the acceptability of SEA to the students. On the other hand, the departures in SEA implementation occurred because the teacher judged considerable SEA content and activities to be in need of modification to make it more intellectually available to his class of special students and more congruent to their lifestyles.

SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

This section of the hands-off pilot study report is devoted to an overview of results from all of the previously reported case studies. The section is organized by the same topical headings utilized in each case study report. The topics are directly related to the focal questions posed in Table 1 of the Purpose subsection of the Introduction to this report, and are in the same sequence as the focal questions were presented in Table 1. Thus, this summary should be seen as presenting an overview of the answers from each of the case studies to the focal questions of the hands-off pilot study.

The summary is not an averaging or reduction of findings across cases. That type of summary is not congruent with the purposes of the hands-off pilot study of SEA, for which the case study orientation was adopted. There was an intent to be sensitive to the variations among SEA users, and, therefore, the summaries here contain a presentation of any variations revealed.

In addition to a presentation of the variations in findings among cases, there are discussions of the possible reasons for those variations. Of course, with the limitations posed in making interpretations based on very small sample sizes, these interpretations must be viewed as tentative rather than solidly supported.

Finally, at some points there were methodological shortenings in the study that prevented obtaining a clear answer to the focal question

posed. In these instances, the summary shall include discussion of these shortenings.

Implementation

The implementation topcis refer to various aspects of how the course was administered by the teachers. The major topic here is the extent to which the course was presented in the way intended by the SEA developer. Other implementation topics are also included because each reveals a feature of the students' contacts with SEA.

Presentation congruence. In all except two classes, departures from lesson presentations as described in the SEA Teacher's Manual and intended by the SEA developer were only slight. In one of these two classes, U7-B, the teacher's departures were (a) several omissions, possibly due to oversight, and (b) allowing students to develop their own drams for Unit II, without having the dramas relate to the SEA strategy. In the other class, U9, the departures were similar to (b) above in that examples, including the dramas, were changed by the teacher to make them more relevant to the students' lives, but in the process the relation to basic SEA objectives was lost.

U7-B and U9 are similar to one another and different from the other classes studied by virtue of having many students of very low verbal abilities. Both classes had a special status in the eyes of their teachers as being in need of special educational efforts. One device that both teachers seemed to use to provide instruction to these classes was to allow the students to relate their studies to their lives.

Perhaps because it was the teachers' first experience with SEA, they neglected to clarify the relation of the modified examples, etc., to SEA objectives.

Therefore, in this sample, divergence from the SEA developer's intents seems to have been primarily a function of special treatment deemed necessary for students with very low verbal abilities. (The topic of verbal capabilities and learning in SEA shall be discussed further in the later subsection on Difficulty.) For all other classes, SEA lessons presentations seemed to have been very close to what the SEA developer had intended, and contributed to good tests of the acceptability and effectiveness of SEA in those classes.

Presentation time. Presentation of SEA lessons usually involved more than the 30 minute time period the lessons were designed for. However, there was no case in which class periods were less than 45 minutes, so that teachers may have not felt pressured to present the lessons as rapidly as they might have been able to present them. Nonetheless, when teachers were limited by 45 minute periods in U7 and U9, they did indicate difficulty in finishing some of the lessons completely within the time available. In general, sufficient time was available to present SEA in a way that allowed for good tests of SEA.

Fit within the teacher's program. In every case SEA was taught as a separate course, without integration into the subject matter(s) regularly taught by the teacher. However, the teachers in S8 and S9 indicated that they believed the course could be integrated into what they taught, respectively, in religion and English, if they had sufficient

time to prepare. The other teachers did not indicate any dissatisfaction with teaching it as a separate course. Also related to SEA's fit is the S7 teacher's comment that allowing as large a course as SEA to be taught as a separate course did involve cutting some time away from other basic school subjects.

Student accountability. While all teachers taught SEA as a separate course, they usually included any grades they gave for SEA as a part of that given for the subject matter they were regularly assigned to teach. One exception was in U9, in which the teacher graded students' SEA work in the "Work Habits" section of the report card.

In general, students in every class seemed to take the SEA tests at least as seriously as they took other tests, whether or not the teacher indicated that the test would be graded.

Absences. Absentees varied from an average of less than 1 percent of the students absent per class session (in S8) to an average of at least 36 percent (in U9). Only in U8, in which the rate was about 11 percent for the last three SEA units, was there a regular and complete makeup opportunity for students who had been absent. In U9, with the highest absentee rate, there was a makeup class once a week for the first unit, but the teacher did not continue these because he believed that students were purposefully missing SEA classes. In all cases there was at least individual help given when a student absent from a previous lesson would indicate he/she needed help.

Acceptability

In contrast with the above topics dealing with how the course was presented, the following topics all relate to how whatever was presented as SEA was received, by the teacher and by the students.

The SEA Teacher's Manual. All teachers thought the manual was adequate. The majority praised it as complete, well-organized, and clear. The teacher in U9 said it was the best he'd ever seen in his long years of teaching. However, two of the teachers (in U7 and S9) had difficulty in finding all that was needed for a given lesson.

Reasonableness of preparation time and resource requirements. Although audio tapes and filmstrips required equipment, no teacher commented that resource requirements posed a problem. Only the teacher in S9 believed that preparation time required was unreasonably long for more than one lesson; he made that comment for five of the group work lessons in Unit II.

Instructional quality. All teachers judged most of the parts of SEA as providing at least problem-free instruction. Furthermore, the teacher in S8 judged almost half of the lessons as being "especially good," and the teacher in U8 gave that rating to 72 percent of the lessons. The teachers very often used their perception of the students' reactions to the lesson components as their major basis for rating the instructional quality of SEA, and the teachers' ratings of SEA's instructional quality tend to be related to incidents of student interest, discussed later in this section. While using such a basis for his

ratings, the teacher in S7 went beyond student reactions to emphasize his appreciation for the "logical, thorough development" of content in the course. Though not as emphatic, the teachers in U8 and S9 also commented positively on the design of SEA instruction.

Appeal of presentation mode. There was a general consensus that the audio tape presentation of lessons was helpful, and even efficient, in presenting the content of the lessons. Furthermore, when there was an option for the teachers to use the taped lesson presentation or conduct the lesson themselves, four of the six teachers opted for the tape over nine times out of ten. However, there was some negative comment about the narrators in all cases except U8, in which extended taped instruction had been used before. The only other class in which the teacher had used audio tapes for extensive instructional purposes was U9, and the teacher in U9 said that the content of the SEA tapes was so foreign to the students, he could not comment on their reaction to the tape as a mode.

Classroom management problems caused by SEA. Only U7 and S9 experienced any classroom management problems arising from SEA activities. In U7 the dissemination of student folders posed a problem, with the folders for the two classes always becoming intermixed. In S9 the clustering of students for group work in Unit II was taken by these students as an opportunity to engage in many non-SEA related discussions.

Difficulty. From the teachers' and SEA field coordinators' reports, SEA seemed to be generally at an appropriate difficulty level for all

classes except U7-B and U9. This observed difficulty for these particular students may have arisen from their relatively lower level of verbal ability and/or from their relatively higher rate of absences from SEA lesson presentations. The suggestion that lower verbal ability contributes to difficulty students have with SEA is supported further by the fact that the SCAT verbal ability scores very often were correlated positively with performance on objectives-referenced unit tests.

On the End-of-Course Questionnaire, the majority of students in most of the classes -- including those in U7-b and U9 -- said they thought SEA was about right in difficulty. Only in Case S9 did most of the students report that SEA was too difficult.

Harmlessness. In every class except U7-A and U9, invasion of privacy by SEA was an expressed concern of from one to four students. In most cases, the reference was not clear. For example, "People should mind their own business" may have referred to the fact that student work and measures were collected (even though code numbers, not names were used). Also, "I don't like sharing my values" possibly related to the above mentioned collection of written work or an embarrassment over something said during a class exercise (even though the manual and tape contain a warning when something personal might come up to be shared in class).

All teachers considered all except at most 1 percent of SEA instruction harmless. The teachers in U7 and U8 were concerned that an unequal treatment activity in Unit I may have upset some of their students. In

U9, the teacher was concerned that the suggestion that cheating is wrong might be so foreign to his students' everyday lives as to be harmful to them.

Student interest. There was considerable variation among cases in the interest involvement of students. Indeed, there were in some cases differences in interest at different points in the course. Students in Cases S8 and U8 maintained a rather high level of interest and participation throughout the course. On the other hand, students in Cases S7 and S9 became increasingly negative as the SEA presentations continued. On a different dimension students in Case U9 seemed glad to have been singled out to be in the study, though they were suspicious and withdrawn during most SEA lessons. In Case U7, about half the students in each of the two classes were observed to participate in SEA and said that they were glad to have been involved in SEA, while the other half of the students did not participate and were not glad to have studied SEA.

Effectiveness

The study of the effectiveness of SEA on the students included investigations of the achievement of the explicit SEA objectives, the effects on general moral and value characteristics, and the value of the course as perceived by the students.

Achievement of objectives. There was definite improvement in objectives-referenced test performances in all six classes in which the instruction was congruent with the SEA developer's intents.

In these classes the average level of attainment on these measures varied, however, from a high of 73 percent of objectives-referenced unit test items correct in S8 to a low of 33 percent in U7-A. The level of achievement was often related to verbal ability scores, with highest average verbal ability classes doing better than lower average verbal ability classes and with students of higher verbal ability generally doing better than their classmates with lower verbal ability.

The major objectives of knowledge and use of the SEA strategy were attained or at least approached by most students in some cases, but were exhibited by only a few students in other cases. First, a functional knowledge of the strategy (which included uncued memory of the strategy step labels and over one half of the functions involved in each step) was manifest by almost everyone in classes S7 and S8, by over half the students in classes U7-A and U8, and by only 18 percent of the students in class S9. In the remaining classes, U7-B and U9, in which the instruction departed significantly from the developer's intents, the percents of students demonstrating a functional knowledge were 12 and 0, respectively. Performances on the measure of strategy knowledge were usually related to verbal ability test scores.

With regard to probable future use of the strategy, the percent of students who knew at least some of the strategy functions, had tried some part of the strategy outside class, and thought they would use the strategy in the future for at least some of their value problems ranged from a high of 67 percent in Case S8 to a low of 0 percent in class U7-B.

The percentages for other classes were between 10 and 33 percent.

General effects. Of the four cases for which there were comparison groups, two resulted in statistically significant differential changes. Students in U8 changed more than their schoolmates in the test-only comparison class on measures in the other persons and reflectivity components of SEA. The changes in the measures that most influenced the U8 findings were all in the direction of proposed SEA influence. Specifically, students were indicating greater ethical sensitivity, less manipulative orientations toward others, and greater breadth of consideration of others. In the other case of significant differential change, Case S9 students exhibited greater breadth of consideration of others, but there was less self-description as being reflective and fewer prosocial value terms being high in their ranking of values. The studies of Cases S7 and S8 and their respective comparison groups revealed no statistically significant differences in the changes of general measures scores.

Of the two remaining cases, U9 results for general effects are not reported because so few persons completed the measures. In the other case, U7, general effects were studied by comparing before-SEA scores with after-SEA scores. One measure exhibited significant change in U7; after SEA the students placed more prosocial value terms among the top three values in their value rankings.

The results with the general measures bear no relation to results on any indices of student interest, or achievement of SEA objectives. Neither are they related to other aspects of teacher or student acceptance of SEA or to SEA implementation. Therefore, there is no ready

interpretation of why the general measures exhibited the pattern of change described in the two preceding paragraphs.

However, the only borderline adequacy of the measures in terms of reliability, as was noted in the Methods section of this report, must be considered in making an interpretation of the general measures findings. If the measures, being used as they were in the present study, had a large measurement error component, then they would be less sensitive to any treatment effects, and there would be fewer significant differences, with less consistency in which measures would reveal significant differences. The preceding methodological interpretation of the general effects findings is not offered to suggest that SEA would have the general effects measured if measures had been more reliable. Instead, it is offered to propose that the general effects were not assessed well in the present study.

Perceived value of SEA. This topic of students' perception of the value of SEA was regularly included in the case studies in the Other effects subsection. Only this aspect of other effects is reported here because it is the only aspect related to the set of focal questions presented in the Purpose subsection of the Introduction to this report.

In two cases, S8 and U9, the majority of the students said that SEA was more useful than their other courses; very few students in these classes said SEA was less useful. At the other extreme, in S7 and S9, the majority of students said SEA was less useful, and very few said it was more useful. In the remaining two cases, U7 and U8, either the class

divided its answers almost equally among the more, same, or less useful categories, or a majority said SEA had about the same usefulness as other courses.

Conclusion

The case studies of the hands-off pilot study of SEA were conducted to provide answers to the focal questions that were posed in Table 1 of the Introduction to this report. The variety of answers from each of the six cases in the study has been presented in the individual case study reports that are the third through eighth sections of this report. The answers from each case have been abbreviated and perceived in juxtaposition to one another in this final section of this volume of the report. The answers have indicated that revision in the version of SEA tested during the 1976-77 school year probably would improve SEA's acceptability and effectiveness for a wider variety of school settings. The background for, and nature of those revisions are presented in Volume II of this report.

REFERENCES

Anderson, Gary J. The Assessment of Learning Environments: A Manual for the Learning Environments Inventory and the My Class Inventory. Halifax, Nova Scotia: Atlantic Institute of Education, 1974.

Christie, Richard and Florence L. Geis. Studies in Machiavellianism. New York: Academic Press, 1970.

Cooperative School and College Ability Tests Series II Handbook. Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, 1967.

Rokeach, Milton. The Nature of Human Values. New York: The Free Press, 1973.

APPENDIX 1

SEA TEACHER AND STUDENT

BACKGROUND INFORMATION FORM

Teacher_____ Date_____

School_____

SEA Teacher and Student Background Information

1. a. How many years have you been employed as a teacher of 7th, 8th or 9th grade students?

   b. How many years teaching at other levels? (Please specify level).

2. How many years have you taught in your present school or with most of your present colleagues?

3. How would you characterize your own teaching style?

4. Within the constraints of the three following scales, please check (✓) on the line where you would place your own teaching style.

   Scale 1: Structured |___|___|___|___| Spontaneous

   Scale 2: Individual-oriented |___|___|___|___| Class-oriented

   Scale 3: Process-oriented |___|___|___|___| Outcome-oriented

5. Please check the one of the following that most closely characterizes your own racial-cultural background.

   ___ Black American ___ Oriental

   ___ White American ___ Spanish-speaking

   ___ Other, please specify: _____

6. Using the above racial-cultural background categories, please indicate on the reverse side of this sheet the background of the students in the class(es) in which you shall be presenting SEA.

APPENDIX 2

TEACHER'S LESSON REPORT FORM

Class _____

SEA TEACHER REPORT ON UNIT ___, LESSON ___

Presentation date: _____ Time Began: _____ Time Ended: _____

Other class sessions used (Give date(s) and time(s)):

Code Numbers of Absent Students:

	Presentation Mode (TAPE, TEACHER OR BOTH)	Presentation differed from procedure in Manual? (YES/NO)	Evaluation checkpoints (Use all appropriate codes at bottom of this page*)
A. LESSON PARTS:			
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			
6.			
7.			
8.			
9.			

Elaboration of the above, as appropriate: _____

_____

_____

_____ (Go to reverse side of sheet)

*Checkpoints and codes for evaluation of some or all of each lesson part:

- G Was especially Good
- N No problems
- D Too Difficult for the class
- E So Easy as to be trivial for the class
- H Had Harmful effects on one or more of the students
- M Caused a classroom Management problem
- O Was disrupted by events Outside the presentation
- F Did not Fit satisfactorily with school goals or attitudes
- I The Teacher's Manual was Inadequate
- A Another type of problem or reaction occurred

Research for Better Schools, Inc. ©1976

B. LESSON AS A WHOLE

Were preparation time and resource requirements reasonable? _____

Were there noteworthy effects of the lesson other than the stated objectives? _____

Were additional student assignments made? _____

Elaboration of the above, as appropriate:

C. Would you suggest any changes in the lesson? If so, please describe:

APPENDIX 3

SEA OBSERVATION PROCEDURES

FOR THE HANDS-OFF PILOT STUDY

SEA Observation Procedures
for the Hands-off Pilot Study

This appendix contains the guidelines followed by the field coordinator in her observations of the teachers and classes who participated in the SEA hands-off pilot study.

Purpose

To describe aspects of classroom presentation not presented as described in the SEA Teacher's Manual and all SEA presentation-related student behaviors, for use in determining needed lesson revisions and in contributing to an overall summary evaluation of SEA.

Observation schedule

For any given SEA classroom, generally every third to fourth lesson presentation was observed with the exception of nine ocassions where the interval was from five to eight lessons. For any SEA lesson, at least two different teachers' presentations were observed.

Position of the Observer

The observer was located unobstrusively at a writing surface from which all students and the teacher could easily be seen and heard.

Substance of the Observation

The observer attended to and recorded the following categories of events:

Time required. For the total lesson presentation, for each of the major parts of the lesson outlined in the SEA Teacher's Manual, and for student activities and responses within the lesson part.

Instructional mode. Whether the teacher presented each part of the lesson solely by him/herself solely by the audio tape, or by both modes.

Differences and incongruencies in the lesson presentation due to:

Complete omission. Specification of any part of a lesson or activity that the teacher left out.

Teacher substitution. Specification of any replacement of the essence of part of the lesson or activity.

Teacher reordering. Specification of any reordering by the teacher of any lesson parts or activities.

Teacher elaboration. Specification of any teacher elaborations of the lesson, such as repeated directions and additional management directives or explanations.

Student behaviors observed and noted related to:

Student confusion. Students did not understand a term or directions.

Student response or reaction. Student's answers to classroom presented questions and indications of positive or negative responses to the course presentation (e.g., either eagerness or unwillingness to participate in a lesson).

Class management. Problems arising directly from the course when following SEA instruction which seemed to lead to unusual difficulty in managing the class. (For example, students pushing each other around while moving into groups, and, loud talking and laughing when a student lesson activity calls for sharing answers with classmate).

Outside disruptions. Arising from outside the course, where something occurred that disrupted the course presentation or attention of more than a few students. (For example, a fire drill, the school public address system, someone entering or leaving the room).

Expression of course effects. Expressions by the teacher or student as to the value or lack of value of something in the lesson. (For example, spontaneous verbal reactions to a lesson: "That was awful," or "I really learned something"; positive or harmful effects; and grumbling).

Supplementary assignments given by the teacher for the class as a whole or for individual student(s).

Preparation of the Observer

The observer reviewed the functions, objectives, lesson procedures worksheets, etc., for the lesson to be observed. The equipment she used was a wall clock, stopwatch, lesson from Manual, pencils and paper.

Report

The Observation Report was written as soon after the lesson presentation as possible. The heading of the report included the unit number and lesson number observed, the school-class codes, the presentation date, observer's name, number of students, and the total time taken for that lesson. The instructional mode choosen and the time utilized for each lesson part outlined in the SEA Teacher's Manual were also noted.

The main body of each report was a description of all details of the lesson presentation (except those presented explicitly in the SEA Teacher's Manual). The description included specifications of place in

the lesson where the event occurred, the specifics of what occurred, an indication of the number of students involved, and the duration of the occurrences. In the report an abbrevation was used to identify the category of event being reported as follows:

CO -- Complete omission

TS -- Teacher substitution

TE -- Teacher elaboration

SC -- Student confusion

SR -- Student responses or reactions

CM -- Class management

OD -- Outside disruptions

EE -- Expression of course effects

Also, TM was the abbreviation used when, for contextual clarification, it was necessary to refer to an event explicitly prescribed by the SEA Teacher's Manual.

APPENDIX 4

QUESTIONS FOR THE FINAL INTERVIEW

WITH THE SEA TEACHERS

Questions for the Final Interview

with the SEA Teachers

1. Looking back, how do you see SEA fitting or relating to the other topics you teach to those students?
2. How did (or will) you go about grading students on their SEA work? Do you believe that the SEA students perceived the unit tests in the same way as other tests you have given? If not the same, how were the unit tests perceived?
3. When students were absent from an SEA lesson presentation, did they usually make it up? If so, how?
4. Was the Teacher's Manual generally adequate?
   Does it have any noteworthy strengths? Weaknesses? Too much or too little?
5. What do you think about the audio tape presentations of SEA lessons?
6. In general, what do you think about the flow or sequence of topics and activities in SEA? In particular, do you believe the four SEA units were well designed and sequenced for desired instructional effects?
7. Do you believe that the course was, or will be, valuable for some or all of your students?
8. Did you encounter any particularly annoying problems in teaching the course? Please specify.
9. Did you find any particularly pleasing features in teaching the course? Please specify.
10. If SEA were available, would you use it again?
11. Do you have any recommendations for changing the course or expanding positive course aspects?

APPENDIX 5

THE END-OF-COURSE QUESTIONNAIRE

AND CODING/SCORING DIRECTIONS

Code Number _____ Date _____

END-OF-COURSE QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Write at least four things that describe the kind of person you would like to be.

2. Write what you think is the best reason for acting ethically.

3. Think about the things you learned in the Skills for Ethical Action course.

   a. List those things you learned in Skills for Ethical Action that you believe are important or useful to know or to be able to do.

   b. In general, how important or useful to you are the things taught in the Skills for Ethical Action course compared with things taught in most of your other courses? (Check one)

   _____ More important or useful than other courses.

   _____ Less important or useful than other courses.

   _____ About the same as other courses.

Research for Better Schools, Inc. © 1976

4. a. How hard were most of the things you were supposed to learn or do in the Skills for Ethical Action course? (Check one)

___Very hard ___Hard ___About right ___Easy ___Very easy

b. How hard were most of the things you were supposed to learn or do in the Skills for Ethical Action course compared with those in other courses you are taking? (Check one)

___Harder than other courses ___Easier than other courses

___About the same as other courses

5. If anything in the Skills for Ethical Action course hurt you or upset you in any way, please write below what happened to hurt or upset you.

6. a. Are you glad you had the Skills for Ethical Action course? (Check one)

___Yes ___NO

b. Write about why you are glad, or about why you are not glad.

7. When you were having the Skills for Ethical Action classes, you used the ethical action strategy. Have you used the ethical action strategy any other times than for class assignments? (Check one) ___Yes ___No

8. How much do you think you will use the ethical action strategy between now and this time next year? (Check one)

_____ I think that I will use wherever I have a value problem.

_____ I think I will use it only for some of my value problems.

_____ I probably won't use it at all.

_____ I can't really say now whether I'll use it or not.

TEST QUESTION

Write about what a person thinks about and does when he or she uses the ethical action strategy. In other words, write a complete description of the strategy, telling what to do for each step. Include all you know about the strategy, so you can get a high score on this question.

End-of-Course Questionnaire
Coding/Scoring Directions

General note: Credit is given to synonymous phrasing of each of the answers given below.

Item 1: Answers are coded as implying (a) sense of control over one's own life, (b) acting consistently with one's own values, (c) caring for others, (d) being fair and/or (e) other, non-creditable answers.

Item 2: Answers are coded as implying (a) respect for others, (b) following personal standards, or (c) other, non-creditable answers.

Item 3a: Answers are judged as to relevance to the content of SEA, and are categorized as being related to one or more of the following: (a) courage of convictions and making one's own decisions, (b) not hurting others and making others happy, (c) being fair to all, (d) being reflective and considering self and others, (e) use of the strategy in general and (f) use of particular subskills of the strategy (specify which). Then a count is made of the SEA content-related learnings listed, with no attempt to weigh some more heavily than others. The score is the number of SEA content-related learnings listed.

Items 3b, 4a, and 4b: Checked answers are recorded. No score is assigned. When more than one is checked or a check is placed between the spaces provided, the particular position of the check(s) is recorded.

Item 5: Answers are coded as (a) no answer here or elsewhere, relating to this question, (b) written response indicating no problem, (c) written response indicating a dislike as a harm, (d) written response indicating an invasion of privacy to any degree, and/or (e) a written response indicating harm from offense or other psychologically damaging input.

End-of-Course Questionnaire

Coding/Scoring Directions (Cont'd)

Item 6a: Recorded as checked. (See directions for Item 3b, et al.)

Item 6b: Answers are coded on dimensions of (a) interest (i.e., boring -- exciting) and (b) perceived value (i.e., helpful -- waste of time).

Items 7 and 8: Recorded as checked. (See directions for Item 3b et al.)

Test Questions: A point is given for each (a) correctly ordered and labelled step name (total of 6), (b) correctly placed substep process (Total of 18), and (c) any additional information concerning the strategy (total of at least 16 points).

Sum the points of the three types above in order to obtain a total score.

Then transform the total score into a verbal label as follows:

Total Score	Levels of Knowledge	Label
0	None	No knowledge
1 - 4	A few names or labels	Below basic
5 - 8	Most main names	Basic
9 - 15	The above, plus 10 to 50 percent of the processes needed to use the strategy.	Partially functional
15 - 24	The above, plus 50 to 100 percent of the processes needed to use the strategy	Functional
25 - 32	The above, plus up to 50 percent of the specific techniques to facilitate exact use of the stategy	Detailed
Above 32	The above, plus additional specific techniques and/ or illustrations of use and contexts for use of the strategy.	Discursive

Total Score: No total, overall Score is obtained.

APPENDIX 6

THE INSTRUCTIONAL OBJECTIVES, UNIT TESTS, AND SCORING DIRECTIONS

UNIT I

INSTRUCTIONAL OBJECTIVES

1. To be able to write a definition of Ethical Action which includes the idea of (a) doing something which is (b) fair or shows equal consideration for (c) self, me, myself, and (d) others, other people. TEST ITEM 2

2. To be able to list course-given reasons for acting ethically. TEST ITEM 3

3. To be able to recall that acting consistently with one's values is an important part of ethical action. TEST ITEM 4

4. To be able to give as a reason for examining own values the need to know one's values in order to act in a way consistent with them. TEST ITEM 4

5. To be able to define caring as a real concern for the well-being (health and happiness) of others. TEST ITEM 7

6. To be able to recall the two course-given aspects of caring: (a) stopping to think how actions might affect others; (b) using the information to guide actions so they have mostly good effects on everyone. TEST ITEM 8

7. To be able to recall that caring about the well-being of others leads to considering the effects of one's action on others, as an essential part of ethical action. TEST ITEM 5

8. To be able to define being fair as giving others the same consideration as yourself in everyday life. TEST ITEM 9

9. To be able to identify the strategy steps from given rephrased definitions. TEST ITEM 6

10. To be disposed to consider acting consistently with one's values as a personally desirable trait. TEST ITEM 1

11. To be disposed to consider showing caring for others as a personally desirable trait. TEST ITEM 1

12. To be disposed to consider that being fair to all persons is a personally desirable trait. TEST ITEM 1

CODE NUMBER _____ _____ TIME YOU STARTED

DATE _____ _____ TIME YOU STOPPED

UNIT I TEST

1. Everyone has ideas about what personal qualities or ways of doing things are really important to show in his or her life. List at least three which you think are important to you.

2. This course is about Ethical Action. Tell us in a few words what you think Ethical Action is.

3. People give many reasons for acting in ways they think are ethical. Write as many reasons as you can think of for acting ethically.

4. This course shows that acting ethically includes knowing what is important to you. Why do you think you must know what is important to you in order to act ethically?

5. This course teaches that caring has a lot to do with ethical action. What do you think caring has to do with ethical action?

Research for Better Schools, Inc. ©1976

6. Each paragraph below describes a step of the Ethical Action Strategy. However, the paragraphs are not in the correct order. Complete this item as follows:

   a. Read each one.

   b. Decide which step is being described. Then write the name of the strategy step after the description.

   c. Go back over the paragraphs and put them in correct order by numbering them one through six.

Step number _____. Picture in your mind what might happen to you and to others if you act in a certain way.

Step name _____

Step number _____. Find that something important to you needs to be shown.

Step name _____

Step number _____. Figure out whether something you might do is ethical.

Step name _____

Step number _____. When you decide what you should do, go ahead and do it.

Step name _____

Step number _____. Think about whether what you did was ethical.

Step name _____

Step number _____. Think of possible actions that might show that something is important to you.

Step name _____

UNIT I TEST (Cont'd)

7. Tell us in a few words what you think the word "caring" means?

8. What are the main things you do in order to show that you care?

9. This course also teaches that being fair is an important part of ethical action. What do you think the word "fairness" means?

UNIT I TESTS

SCORING DIRECTIONS

Give 1 point for each of the specific aspects mentioned for each item below. On all items, synonymous phrasings are permissible.

Item 1: Scored for inclusion of (1) acts consistently with one's values, (2) shows caring for others, and (3) is fair to everyone. (Total possible: 3 points)

Item 2: Scored for the inclusion of the four ideas included in the course definition: (1) doing something, (2) that is fair, or shows equal concern, for (3) oneself, and (4) other persons. (Total possible: 4 points)

Item 3: Scored for the inclusion of the six course-given reasons: (1) personal standards, (2) respect for people, (3) self-benefit, (4) keeping the social order, (5) approval from others and (6) fear of punishment. (Total possible: 6 points)

Item 4: Scored for the descriptions presented in the course: (1) knowing one's values helps one to act consistently with those values, and (2) acting consistently with one's values is an important part of acting ethically. (Total possible: 2 points)

Item 5: Scored for the descriptions presented in the course: (1) caring for others leads one to consider others when deciding what to do, and (2) considering others is an important part of acting ethically. (Total possible: 2 points)

Item 6: Scored for sequence numbering and correct step names. The sequence and labels for the directions in the order given are:

3 Consider self and others

1 Identify the Value Problem

4 Judge

5 Act

6 Evaluate

2 Think Up Action Ideas

(Total possible: 12 points)

Item 7: Scored for course-given definition: a real concern for the well-being (health and happiness) of other people. (The "other people" should not be just particular others, such as friends or family, but others in general.) (Total possible: 1 point)

UNIT I TESTS
SCORING DIRECTIONS

Item 8: Scored for the two course-given aspects: (1) stopping to think how one's own actions might affect others, and (2) using the results of stopping to think to guide one's actions so that they will have mostly good effects on everyone. (Total possible: 2 points)

Total score: Sum across all items to obtain the total score. Maximum possible score is 33 points.

UNIT II

INSTRUCTIONAL OBJECTIVES

1. To be able to state the value problem for a given situation. TEST ITEM 1

2. To be able to recall the characteristics that make an action idea specific. TEST ITEM 2

3. To be able to discriminate specific from nonspecific actions. TEST ITEM 3

4. To be able to recall three checkpoints used to determine if an action idea is possible to do. TEST ITEM 4

5. To be able to recall that the use of situational, spoken and unspoken clues facilitates considering the potential effects of one's actions on others and evaluating the actual effects of others. TEST ITEM 5

6. To be able to recall that the areas to consider when gathering information about potential effects of actions on self and others are: values, feelings, health and safety, and possessions (things one owns). TEST ITEM 6

7. To be able to describe the three course-given techniques for looking at things objectively. TEST ITEM 7

8. To be able to describe how projected consequences are used to judge whether an action idea is ethical. TEST ITEM 8

9. To be able to describe what you ask when evaluating whether or not a completed action is ethical. TEST ITEM 9

10. To be able to identify use of strategy steps by name and in proper sequence from given examples. TEST ITEM 10

CODE NUMBER_____ _____TIME YOU STARTED

DATE_____ _____TIME YOU FINISHED

UNIT II TEST

1. A. Tom thinks it's important to be a good neighbor. Some people he knows are mad at Mrs. Hudson because she called the police about their noisy party. They asked Tom to help them smear paint on her car tonight.

   State Tom's value problem.

   B. Being honest is very important to Carolyn. Today Carolyn saw Betsy take some money out of the teacher's desk. No one else was in the room.

   State Carolyn's value problem.

2. Name the kinds of details that make an action idea specific.

3. Read the sentences below. Check the sentences that are specific about the action that might be taken.

   _____A. Show respect for older people at all times.

   _____B. Feed my sister's canary while she is away next week.

   _____C. Teach my cousin to play basketball.

   _____D. Do something nice for my mother on Mother's Day.

   _____E. Sign up for the band tryout next month.

   _____F. Take better care of my dog.

Research for Better Schools, Inc. ©1976

4. Name some things you should think about in order to decide if something is possible for you to do.

5. You can get information about how people may feel by paying attention to what they say and do and by knowing about the situation they are in. What are the uses that you can make of this information:

6. Pretend that you are trying to figure out what will happen to yourself and other people if you do a certain thing. Name the kinds of things you should think about.

7. When you are trying to decide whether something would be right or wrong to do, you need to be objective. Describe some ways you can use to help you be objective.

8. You have thought about what might happen to you and to other people if you do a certain thing. How do you use that information in judging if that action is ethical?

9. You are trying to figure out whether something someone has done is ethical. What should you ask yourself?

10. Each of the paragraphs below describes one step of the ethical action strategy, but they are not in the right order. Read each paragraph. Write the name of the step it describes in the blank space below the paragraph. Then number the paragraphs in their proper order, using the blanks in front of the paragraphs.

_____ A. Alice felt uneasy when the other people in the class laughed at George because he stuttered. She believed being kind to others was very important. Alice thought, "How can I show that being kind to George means a lot to me?" Step Name _____

_____ B. Alice looked at all the information she had gathered about her action ideas. She decided that most of them would be ethical.
Step Name _____

_____ C. That night Alice looked back at what she had done. She felt good about it. George seemed happy and the other people seemed to feel good too. She decided that her action had really been ethical.
Step Name _____

_____ D. Alice thought of a lot of things she might do. She could try to be extra nice to George herself. She could ask the teacher to speak to the people who laughed at George. Or, she could try to talk to them herself. Step Name _____

_____ E. Alice waited until George was out of the room. Then she talked to the people who made fun of him. She told them how bad George felt when they laughed at him. She asked them to be kind and not to tease George any more.
Step Name _____

_____ F. Alice imagined what might happen as a result of her action. She pictured herself feeling proud of what she had done. She imagined George being more willing to talk in class. She thought the other people might feel good about themselves too.
Step Name _____

10. Each of the paragraphs below describes one step of the ethical action strategy, but they are not in the right order. Read each paragraph. Write the name of the step it describes in the blank space below the paragraph. Then number the paragraphs in their proper order, using the blanks in front of the paragraphs.

_____ A. The guys that Tyrone ran around with were hanging out on the corner drinking beer every weekend. Tyrone tried that once or twice but he didn't think much of himself the morning after. Respecting himself was very important to Tyrone. "How can I show that I value my self-respect?" Tyrone asked himself.
Step Name _____

_____ B. Tyrone looked at all the information he had gathered about his action ideas. He decided that two of them would be ethical.
Step Name _____

_____ C. Later Tyrone looked back at what he had done. He was pretty proud of himself. He knew his parents were pleased. And some of the guys told him they were glad he had spoken up because they didn't like hanging out and drinking either. He felt he had done the ethical thing.
Step Name _____

_____ D. Tyrone asked himself, "What might I do? Well, I guess I could just go along with the guys so they wouldn't make fun of me. Or I could pretend my parents wouldn't let me go out. Or, I could just tell them I don't want to hang around and drink beer."
Step Name _____

_____ E. The guys asked Tyrone if he would be on the corner that night. "No," he said. "I don't feel good about myself when I just hang around and drink. I'd rather have you guys over to the house and listen to records or something."
Step Name _____

_____ F. Tyrone pictured how he would feel if he carried out the action he chose. He probably wouldn't get in trouble and he would save money too. He imagined that his parents would be pleased. He thought that some of the guys might want to go along with him. But others in the group, he thought, might get mad.
Step Name _____

UNIT II TESTS

SCORING DIRECTIONS

General note: On all items, synonymous phrasings are permissible.

Item 1: Each subitem, A and B, is scored correct (2 points) or incorrect (0 points) on the basis of the form presented in Lesson 1 of this unit: How can the person show that the value is important (or means a lot) to her (or him)? (Total points possible: 2 for each subquestion = 4)

Item 2: Score 1 point each for (1) what is to be done, and (2) where or when it is to be done. (Total possible: 2 points)

Item 3: Score 1 point each for (1) checking B and not checking A or C, and (2) checking E and not checking D or F. (Total possible: 2 points)

Item 4: Score 1 point each for (1) time to do it, (2) resources to do it, and (3) permission to do it. (Total possible: 3 points)

Item 5: Score 2 points each for (1) considering how actions might affect others, and (2) thinking back on how actions did affect others. (Total possible: 4 points)

Item 6: Score 2 points each for: your own and the others' (1) values, (2) feelings, (3) health and safety, and (4) possessions. (Total possible: 8 points)

Item 7: Score 2 points for all three: time (or wait a while), place (or get away from the confusion), and person (or talk it over with someone). Score 1 point for just two of the above; score 0 points if just has one. (Total possible: 2 points)

Item 8: Score 2 points for decide if it would have mostly positive effects for everyone. (Total possible: 2 points)

Item 9: Score 2 points each for decide if it (1) did have mostly positive effects for everyone involved, and (2) showed that the person's value was important to him or her. (Total possible: 4 points)

UNIT II TESTS
SCORING DIRECTIONS

Item 10: Score 1 point for each correct numbering and each correct label. Correct answers are the same on both forms of the item and are as follows:

1 A. Identify the value problem

4 B. Judge

6 C. Evaluate

2 D. Get action ideas

5 E. Act

3 F. Consider self and others

(Total possible: 12 points)

Total score: Add scores from items 1 through 10 to obtain the total score. (Total possible: 43 points)

UNIT III

INSTRUCTIONAL OBJECTIVES

1. To be able to indicate knowledge of the meaning of course-given value terms. TEST ITEM I 5

2. To be able to recall the three things which are done in each of the strategy steps in order to carry them out. TEST ITEM I 1a THROUGH I 1f.

3. To be able to state a value problem for a situation chosen by the student. TEST ITEM II 3

4. To be able to list at least three different action ideas for a value problem chosen by the student. TEST ITEM II 4

5. To be able to restate a general action idea so that it is specific. TEST ITEM II 5

6. To indicate consideration of possible effects of student-generated action ideas in four areas (values, feelings, health and safety, and possessions) on the other persons involved. TEST ITEM II 6

7. To indicate consideration of possible effects of student-generated action ideas in four areas (values, feelings, health and safety, and possessions) on the other persons involved. TEST ITEM II 6

8. To be able to recall what is asked when thinking of the general effects of an action: What might happen if everyone did this? TEST ITEM I 3

9. To be able to apply the question for general effects when reviewing possible effects of a specific student-generated action idea which has not been used previously in the course. TEST ITEM II 7

10. To be able to recall the names of the three course-given ways of gathering information about the point of view/feelings of others: role taking, examining past experience, and asking directly. TEST ITEM I 2

11. To be able to state what uses can be made of the information gathered in the evaluate step: (a) to help one act in the future that shows that value; and (b) to help one use the strategy better. TEST ITEM I 4

CODE NUMBER_____ _____TIME YOU STARTED

DATE_____ _____TIME YOU FINISHED

UNIT III TEST

PART I:

1. The steps of the Ethical Action Strategy are listed below. Underneath each step name the things you would do in order to carry out that step.

IDENTIFY THE VALUE PROBLEM

THINK UP ACTION IDEAS

CONSIDER SELF AND OTHERS

JUDGE

ACT

EVALUATE

2. List ways for getting information about the points of view and feelings of other people.

Research for Better Schools, Inc. © 1976

3. What do you ask when you check an action idea for general effects?

4. How can you use the information you get from evaluating an action?

5. There are five general value terms below. In the space next to each term write what it means.

RELIGION

HAPPINESS

EQUALITY

AN EXCITING LIFE

FREEDOM

PART II:

For this part of the test you will need to think of a problem situation you know about that involves values. It should not be one that you have worked with in the course. It may be a problem situation of your own or it may be one that someone else has. When you have thought of a problem situation, answer the following questions:

1. Briefly describe the situation:

2. Name the value involved:

3. State the value problem:

4. Now think up some action ideas for the value problem you stated. List three of the action ideas here.

5. Choose one of the action ideas you wrote above. In the space below, write it so that it is specific.

6. Consider the effects this action might have on one of the people who would be involved. First, write the areas you consider. Then, use a plus (+), or minus (-), or zero (0) to show whether the effect on that person would probably be positive, negative, or neutral for that area. Do the same for each area.

7. Tell what the general effects might be for the action idea you chose.

UNIT III TESTS

SCORING DIRECTIONS

General Note: On all items, synonymous phrasings are acceptable.

Part I

Item 1: Score 1 point for each of the things you do to carry out each of the strategy steps, as follows:

Identify the Value Problem: (1) describe the situation, (2) ask which value is involved, and (3) state the problem.

Think up Action Ideas: (1) brainstorm, (2) make sure actions are specific, and (3) check if actions are possible.

Consider Self and Others: (1) think of effects on self, (2) think of effects on others, and (3) think of general effects.

Judge: (1) be objective, (2) review and summarize information, and (3) change or reject.

Act: (1) select, (2) commit, and (3) persevere.

Evaluate: (1) examine the action, (2) review use of strategy, and (3) consider the value.

(Total possible: 18 points)

Item 2: Score 1 point each for (1) role taking (or role playing), (2) examining past experience, and (3) asking directly. (Total possible: 3 points)

Item 3: Score 1 point for inclusion of asking, "What might happen if everyone did this? (Total possible: 1 point)

Item 4: Score 1 point each for (1) to help one use the strategy better and (2) to help one act in the future in a way that shows the value. (Total possible: 2 points)

Item 5: Score 1 point for each term's meaning. A correct answer need not be a dictionary type definition, and may stress the particular meaning of the term for that student. However, an answer such as "Religion is important to me" is not to be scored as correct. (Total possible: 5 points)

PART II

Item 1: Do not score.

UNIT III TESTS
SCORING DIRECTIONS

Item 2: Do not score.

Item 3: Score 1 point for the correct form: "How can I (or another person) show that the value (in Item 2 above) is important to me (or the other person)?" (Total possible: 1 point)

Item 4: Score 1 point for each of the action ideas presented that are relatable to the value problem implied by the above 3 items. (Total possible: 3 points)

Item 5: Score 1 point each for the inclusion of information concerning (1) what and (2) where or when, in the chosen action idea. (Total possible: 2 points)

Item 6: Score 1 point each for the listing of areas as (1) values, (2) feelings, (3) health and safety, and (4) possessions. (Total possible: 4 points)

Item 7: Score 1 point for a reasonable answer to the question "What might happen if everyone did this?" (Total possible: 1 point)

Total Score: Add points from all items in parts I and II. Total possible: 40 points.

UNIT IV

INSTRUCTIONAL OBJECTIVES

1. To be able to state a value problem prompted by a value chosen by the student. TEST ITEM II 1

2. To be able to recall that, in addition to a problem situation, wanting to do something to show a value of one's own initiates use of the Ethical Action strategy. TEST ITEM I 1

3. To be able to recall that action ideas may be sought from sources of experience or expertise, such as organizations, libraries, and school personnel. TEST ITEM I 2

4. To be able to generate for a self-chosen value at least three specific action ideas which have not been previously used in the course. TEST ITEM II 3

5. To be able to indicate particular sources of experience and expertise that could be used in seeking action ideas for given values. TEST ITEM I 4

6. To be able to spontaneously include others not immediately involved, when describing anticipated consequences for others. TEST ITEM I 5

7. To be able to apply the things you do to carry out the Judge step: (a) be objective; (b) review and summarize information; and (c) change or reject for self-chosen action ideas which have not been used previously in the course. TEST ITEMS II 4a; II 4b; II 4c

8. To be able to spontaneously seek assistance from more knowledgeable others in achieving objectivity. TEST ITEM I 6

9. To be able to apply the things you do to carry out the Act step: (a) select; (b) commit; (c) persevere. TEST ITEMS II 4d; II 4e; II 4f

10. To be able to recall at least three course-given methods which may be used to assist in persevering to accomplish/complete an ethical action. TEST ITEM I 3

11. To be able to apply the three things you do to evaluate an action idea which has been acted upon: (a) examine the action; (b) review use of strategy; and (c) consider the value. TEST ITEMS II 5a; II 5b; II 5c

12. To be able to apply the course definition of "ethical action" by determining whether given statements describe ethical actions and by indicating what component(s) of ethical action is missing in the statements judged not to describe an ethical action. TEST ITEM I 7

13. To be able to write a description of the Ethical Action Strategy which includes the six step names and ways to use the steps.

14. To be disposed to list items indicating personal control, caring for others, and fairness as personally desirable characterstics.

15. To be able to recall three course-related personal characteristics or abilities which continued use of the SEA strategy is designed to enhance: (a) acting consistently with one's values; (b) acting in a way that shows genuine concern for others; and (c) making fair decisions. TEST ITEM I 8

16. To be disposed to evaluate positively the usefulness of the Ethical Action Strategy to them in their lives in the near future.

CODE NUMBER _____ _____ TIME YOU STARTED

DATE _____ _____ TIME YOU STOPPED

UNIT IV TEST

PART I:

1. There are two occasions when you might use the Ethical Action Strategy. One is when you have a problem situation you want to do something about. What is the second?

2. You are trying to think up some action ideas for one of your values. What sources could you go to for help in thinking up action ideas?

3. List at least three ways you could use to make sure you finish doing something that is hard and is taking more time than you thought it would.

4. Pretend that one of the values below is important to you. Underline the one you choose.
"A World of Beauty" "Religion" "Peace" "Equality"

   Then name some kinds of people or groups whom you might go to for help in getting action ideas for a problem involving that value.

5. Rudy's idea is to have a backyard bazaar to earn money to buy sports equipment for the retarded children at the state school. He is really excited about the idea. He has convinced his sister Nancy to help him with the sale. What people might be affected if Rudy carried out his idea?

Research for Better Schools, Inc. ©1976

6. Rudy is really anxious to carry out his idea, but he doesn't know much about retarded children. Tell how he might be objective in judging whether his idea is ethical or not.

7. Remember the definition of "ethical action." Use the definition to decide whether items a, b, c, and d below describe ethical actions. For the ones that do not describe an ethical action, write what part or parts of the definition of "ethical action" is missing.

   a. Freda decided to paint a picture and give it to her grandmother for Christmas. She thought that would be good for her and everyone else involved. She planned to do the painting, but she never got around to doing it.

      Write here what is missing, if anything.

   b. Patrick thought that fixing his brother's bike would have good effects for everybody. So he worked on the bike until it could be used.

      Write here what is missing, if anything.

   c. Willie's friends didn't like Willie's little brother, because the kid was always pestering them. Willie wanted to show that his family was important to him. So he took his little brother with him when he went to the basketball game with his friends.

      Write here what is missing, if anything.

   d. Cindy decided to spend all Saturday helping her parents with work around their apartment, instead of having fun with her friends.

      Write here what is missing, if anything.

8. In what ways could people expect to improve themselves if they used the Ethical Action Strategy often?

PART II:

For this part of the test you will need to think of a value that you think someone like yourself might wish to show. Think of a value for which you could write action ideas.

1. Write the value you have chosen here: _____

2. State the value problem.

3. Think up action ideas. Write three specific action ideas that would be possible for someone like you to do.

4. Pretend that for each idea you have listed you have thought of the possible effects for yourself and for all of the other people involved. You also have decided what the general effects would be. Now tell how you would go about doing each of the following things.

   a. be objective

   b. review and summarize information

   c. change or reject

   d. select

   e. commit

   f. persevere

5. Pretend you have carried out one of the action ideas. You have acted. Now tell how you go about doing each of the following.

a. examine the action

b. review use of strategy

c. consider the value

UNIT IV TESTS

SCORING DIRECTIONS

General Note: On all items, synonymous phrasings are acceptable.

PART I:

Item 1: Score 2 points for an answer indicating "wanting to do something to show a value of one's own." (Total possible: 2 points)

Item 2: Score 1 point each for up to 2 sources of expertise or expertise or experience, e.g., parents, teachers, counselors, library references, and special organizations. (Total possible: 2 points)

Item 3: Score 1 point each for up to 3 of the course-given ways to help one persevere: imagine the action completed, write notes to yourself, remember a hero or heroine, and one specified personal way. (Total possible: 3 points)

Item 4: Score 1 point each for up to 2 sources, each of which must be judged by the scorer to be specified sufficiently to be relatable to the value chosen. (Total possible: 2 points)

Item 5: Score 1 point for up to 3 people or groups that are not explicitly mentioned in the question, e.g., Rudy's parents, their neighbors, gym teacher at the state school, and parents of the retarded children. (Total possible: 3 points)

Item 6: Score 2 points for any suggestion that Rudy might talk with someone knowledgeable about retarded children. (Total possible: 2 points)

Item 7: Score each subitem a, b, c, and d as follows:

a. Score 1 point for answer indicating only that that the action part, doing something, is missing. (Total possible: 1 point)

b. Score 1 point for answer indicating that nothing is missing; the action was ethical. (Total possible: 1 point)

c. Score 1 point for answer indicating consideration of others is missing. (Total possible: 1 point)

d. Score 1 point for answer indicating consideration of self is missing. (Total possible: 1 point)

UNIT IV TESTS
SCORING DIRECTIONS

Item 8: Score 1 point each for (1) acting more to show their values, (2) acting in ways that show more caring for other people, and (3) more of their decisions would be fair. (Total possible: 3 points)

PART II:

Item 1: Do not score.

Item 2: Score 1 point for the correct form: "How can I (or another person) show that (the value in Item 1 above) is important to me (or the other person)?" (Total possible: 1 point)

Item 3: Score 1 point each for up to 3 action ideas that are both related to the value problem given in Item 2 above, and are "specific," i.e., indicate clearly both what is to be done and when or where it is to be done. (Total possible: 3 points)

Item 4: Score each subitem a through f as follows:

a. Score 1 point for answers indicating any of the three course-given ways to be objective, e.g., wait a while to decide, go someplace quiet to think it over, and find someone who is not involved to talk it over with. (Total possible: 1 point)

b. Score 1 point each for answers indicating (1) make sure that you are right about the possible effects on each person involved and (2) then ask whether the action idea would have mostly positive effects for everyone involved. (Total possible: 2 points)

c. Score 1 point each for answers indicating (1) if an action idea does not have mostly positive effects for everyone involved, see if you can change it so it does, and (2) then if you can't change it to be ethical, drop idea. (Total possible: 2 points)

d. Score 1 point for answers indicating choose one of the ethical action ideas to do. (Total possible: 1 point)

e. Score 1 point for some method of promising yourself you will do it. (Total possible: 1 point)

f. Score 1 point for specification of anything that would help a person continue to carry out an action until completion. (Total possible: 1 point)

UNIT IV TESTS
SCORING DIRECTIONS

Item 5: Score each subitem a, b, and c as follows:

a. Score 1 point for an answer such as see if the effects on each person involved were mostly positive. (Total possible: 1 point)

b. Score 1 point for an answer such as see if you used each step of the strategy or see where you can improve for each step of the strategy. (Total possible: 1 point)

c. Score 1 point for an answer such as ask if the value is more or less important to you now. (Total possible: 1 point)

Total Score: Add points from all items in both parts I and II. Total possible: 36 points.

APPENDIX 7

GENERAL MORAL AND VALUES

CHARACTERISTICS MEASURES

General Moral and Values Characteristics Measures

On the following pages are copies of the general moral and values characteristics measures which were completed by students in SEA classes and by the comparison students not experiencing SEA instruction. The measures were administered in the order presented in the following pages. Two forms of the fifth instrument, the Values Survey, are presented in these pages; however, the students saw only one of the forms, with approximately one half of the students completing each of the forms.

The nature and relation to SEA of each of the measures is described briefly as follows:

1. Modified I-E Scale: A locus of control scale, with items designed by the SEA evaluator to relate a personal internal and external orientation in the moral values domain. The SEA materials stress that by sufficient forethought and self-evaluation one can achieve greater control over the ethical nature of one's own actions. Thus, SEA should lead to increased internal locus of control beliefs in the moral value domain.

2. Mach's Scale: The children's version of Christie's measures of the Machievellian orientation in interpersonal relationships.[1] One basic SEA theme is that a genuine concern for other persons is

---

[1]Richard Christie and Florence L. Geis. Studies in Machiavellianism. New York: Academic Press, 1970.

both a positive personal characteristic and a basis for acting ethically. Thus, SEA should lead to an increase in attribution of positive characteristics to others and a decrease in the negative attributions associated with Machiavellianism.

3. Self-Description Questionnaire: Designed by the SEA evaluator to relate to a planful-reflective orientation (12 items) and valuing opportunities to present views about oneself to others (5 items). The two sets of items are interspersed with one another in the Questionnaire. A salient characteristic of the SEA strategy is its emphasis on systematic planning and review. Thus, SEA should lead to increased reports of a personal preference for reflective, as opposed to impulsive, style. Also, because SEA does involve students in classroom interchanges concerning their own views, the second scale is included to index student attitudes toward expressing their views to others.

4. Learning Environment Scales: Perception of intraclass friction, cohesion, competition, and general satisfaction with the class. There are seven items for each of the four subscales, which are interspersed with one another in the form presented. The scales are from the Learning Environment Inventory, by Anderson.[2] If the SEA theme of genuine concern for other persons is manifest in the students' relations

---

[2] Gary J. Anderson. The Assessment of Learning Environments: A Manual for the Learning Environments Inventory and the My Class Inventory. Halifax Nova Scotia: Atlantic Institute of Education, September, 1974.

to one another, then both intraclass friction (e.g., bickering and a sense of competition among students in the class should be reduced). On the other hand, SEA's utilization of many activities that allow for students' presentation of what is important to them should lead to perceptions of intraclass cohesion (e.g., students knowing one another) and a greater sense of satisfaction with the class.

5. Values Survey: One of the two lists of value terms are the "Instrumental values" from Rokeach[3]; the other list was developed by the SEA evaluator to contain terms parallel to the Rokeach list. Only the second page, the choice of the top three values, is scored. The Survey is scored for inclusion of certain of the prosocial values chosen as among the top three. These values are "Forgiving," "Helpful," "Honest," and "Responsible," from the first list, and "Considerate," "Aiding," "Truthful," and "Reliable," from the second list. As with Mach's Scale and the friction and competition scales of the Learning Environment Inventory, this measure is related to the SEA theme of genuine concern for others.

6. Putting Values Into Action: Designed by the SEA evaluator to assess the extent that the students perceive their values are manifest in their activities. Scored for the number of answers that are (1) relatable to the value listed and (2) specific enough to indicate activities, rather than general behavior dispositions. The strategy

---

[3]Milton Rokeach. The Nature of Human Values. New York: The Free Press, 1973.

that is the core of SEA content involves the students' moving from the specification of value terms representing what's important to the student to the specification of actions that manifest those values. (Though the value terms used in SEA are not those in the measure's lists, the SEA instruction proceeds in such a manner as to develop the process independent of the particular value terms used.) Therefore, SEA should lead to an increase in the number of actions students can relate to the values they claim to have.

7. Before You Decide...: Designed by the SEA evaluator to assess sensitivity to ethical issues. Scored for number of answers relating to equity and humanitarianism. Not uniquely relatable to SEA, this measure is included as a type of outcome that might be expected of any moral/ethical education course: The perception of ethical issues when they are not salient in problem situations.

8. What Happens to Whom? Designed by the SEA evaluator to assess the breadth of consideration of others. Scored for the number of people listed for whom a reasonable consequence is given. SEA is designed to increase the student's desire and capability to include all possible affected persons in his/her consideration of the consequences of an act. Thus, SEA should lead to an increased in the number of others perceived as affected by an action.

MODIFIED I – E SURVEY

DIRECTIONS: Read each question. Decide whether your answer is closer to "Yes" or "No".
If your answer is closer to NO, fill in [1].
If your answer is closer to YES, fill in [2].

* 1. Do you feel that most of the time it doesn't pay to try to do what you think is right because things never turn out right anyway?

* 2. Do you believe that if things start out well in the morning that it's going to be a good day no matter what you do?

* 3. Do you feel that you usually can't make your own decisions because other people don't give you any choice?

4. Do the things you do show other people what's important to you?

* 5. Do you feel that when you do something wrong there's very little you can do to make it right?

* 6. Do you feel that one of the best ways to handle most problems is just not to think about them?

7. Do you believe that whether you try hard to treat others well has much to do with whether they respect you?

* 8. Do you believe that you cannot do much to make others feel good?

9. Do you believe that whether or not you respect yourself depends on how you act?

10. Can you usually make things turn out well for you and other people, too?

* 11. Most of the time is it hard for you to get to do things that are important to you?

* 12. Do you believe that when bad things are going to happen they just are going to happen no matter what you do to try to stop them?

* 13. Do you feel that when someone doesn't respect you there's little you can do about it?

14. Do you believe that you are able to decide what you should do and take the blame if you are wrong?

---

*Revised items.

Research for Better Schools, Inc. © 1976

MACH'S SCALE

DIRECTIONS: Read each statement below. Decide if you agree with it. Then fill in your answer on the answer sheet as follows:

If you Agree Very Much, fill in the [4]

If you Agree a Little, fill in the [3]

If you Disagree a Little, fill in the [2]

If you Disagree Very Much, fill in the [1]

15. Never tell anyone why you did something unless it will help you.

* 16. Most people are good and kind.

17. The best way to get along with people is to tell them things to make them happy.

* 18. You should do something only when you are sure it is right.

19. It is smartest to believe that all people will be mean if they have a chance.

* 20. You should always be honest, no matter what.

21. Sometimes you have to hurt other people to get what you want.

22. Most people won't work hard unless you make them.

* 23. It is better to be ordinary and honest than famous and dishonest.

* 24. It is better to tell someone why you want him to help you than to make up a good story to get him to do it.

* 25. Successful people are mostly honest and good.

26. Anyone who completely trusts anyone else is asking for trouble.

27. A criminal is just like other people except that he is stupid enough to get caught.

* 28. Most people are brave.

29. It is smart to be nice to important people even if you don't really like them.

* 30. It is possible to be good in every way.

* 31. Most people cannot be easily fooled.

32. Sometimes you have to cheat a little to get what you want.

* 33. It is never right to tell a lie.

34. It hurts more to lose money than to lose a friend.

*Reversed items.

SELF-DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE

DIRECTIONS: Read each statement below. Decide if it is something that you would say about yourself. Then fill in your answer on the answer sheet as follows:

If it is Definitely True About You, fill in the [4]

If it is Mostly True About You, fill in the [3]

If it is Mostly Not True About You, fill in the [2]

If it is Definitely Not True About You, fill in the [1]

*R 35. I like to try to figure out why I do things.

R 36. It's important to me to plan out things before I begin to work on them.

*R 37. I like to do things quickly, and get on to other things.

E 38. I enjoy talking about myself.

R 39. I don't like it when I have to do something so quickly I don't have time to think about it.

*R 40. I seldom think about why I do what I do.

E 41. I like school assignments where I can write or talk about myself.

R 42. I want to learn how to spend more time on things I think are important.

*E 43. I feel uneasy when I say anything to others about myself.

R 44. I think things out before I act.

E 45. I enjoy comparing my view of myself with others' views of me.

*R 46. I don't think planning helps get things done.

E 47. It is important to me to let others know my opinions.

R 48. I try to figure out why others do what they do.

R 49. I spend quite a bit of time thinking about what I see and hear.

*R 50. I usually am impatient when a friend wants to plan the details of something we are going to do together.

R 51. I like to spend more of my time thinking than most people do.

R - Reflectivity subscale items.
E - Expressivity subscale items.
* - Reversed items.

Research for Better Schools, Inc. ©1976

LEARNING ENVIRONMENT SCALES

The purpose of the following questions is to find out what your class is like. This is not a "test". You are asked to give your honest, frank opinion about the class which you are now attending.

In answering each question go through the following steps:

1. Read the statement carefully.
2. Think about how well the statement describes your class (the one you are now in).
3. Fill in your answer on your answer sheet according to your agreement or disagreement with the statement, as follows:

   If you believe the statement is Definitely True, fill in [4]
   If you believe the statement is Mostly True, fill in [3]
   If you believe the statement is Mostly Not True, fill in [2]
   If you believe the statement is Definitely Not True, fill in [1]

H 52. Members of the class do favors for one another.

S 53. The students enjoy their class work.

F 54. There is constant bickering among class members.

M 55. Most students want their work to be better than their friends' work.

S 56. Personal dissatisfaction with the class is too small to be a problem.

H 57. A student has the chance to get to know all other students in the class.

*S 58. Many students are dissatisfied with much that the class does.

F 59. Certain students have no respect for other students.

H 60. Members of the class are personal friends.

*S 61. There is considerable dissatisfaction with the work of the class.

M 62. Students compete to see who can do the best work.

F 63. There are tensions among certain groups of students that tend to interfere with class activities.

M 64. Students feel left out unless they compete with their classmates.

S 65. The members look forward to coming to class meetings.

H 66. All students know each other very well.

S 67. After the class, the students have a sense of satisfaction.

*M 68. Most students cooperate rather than compete with one another.

See next page for footnotes.

If you believe the statement is Definitely True, fill in [4]
If you believe the statement is Mostly True, fill in [3]
If you believe the statement is Mostly Not True, fill in [2]
If you believe the statement is Definitely Not True, fill in [1]

F 69. Certain students in the class are responsible for petty quarrels.

*H 70. The class is made up of individuals who do not know each other well.

M 71. There is much competition in the class.

S 72. Students are well-satisfied with the work of the class.

F 73. Certain students don't like other students.

H 74. Each student knows the other members of the class by their first name.

F 75. There is an undercurrent of feeling among students that tends to pull the class apart.

*M 76. Students seldom compete with one another.

F 77. Certain students are considered uncooperative.

*H 78. Students are not in close enough contact to develop likes or dislikes for one another.

M 79. A few of the class members always try to do better than the others.

F - Friction subscale items.
H - Cohesion subscale items.
M - Competition subscale items.
S - Satisfaction subscale items.
* - Reversed items.

CODE NUMBER _____ DATE _____

VALUES SURVEY

A. Below these instructions there is a list of 18 values. Your task is to indicate their importance to YOU, as guiding principles in YOUR life. Study each value carefully and decide whether it is Very Important, Important, or Not Very Important to you.

Make your answer for each value by circling:

0, if that value is Not Very Important

1, if that value is Important

2, if that value is Very Important

Values	Not Very Important	Important	Very Important
Ambitious (hard-working, aspiring)	0	1	2
Broadminded (open-minded)	0	1	2
Capable (competent, effective)	0	1	2
Cheerful (lighthearted, joyful)	0	1	2
Clean (neat, tidy)	0	1	2
Courageous (standing up for your beliefs)	0	1	2
Forgiving (willing to pardon others)	0	1	2
Helpful (working for the welfare of others)	0	1	2
Honest (sincere, truthful)	0	1	2
Imaginative (daring, creative)	0	1	2
Independent (self-reliant, self-sufficient)	0	1	2
Intellectual (intelligent, reflective)	0	1	2
Logical (consistent, rational)	0	1	2
Loving (affectionate, tender)	0	1	2
Obedient (dutiful, respectful)	0	1	2
Polite (courteous, well-mannered)	0	1	2
Responsible (dependable, reliable)	0	1	2
Self-controlled (restrained, self-disciplined)	0	1	2

CODE NUMBER _____ DATE _____

VALUES SURVEY

A. Below these instructions there is a list of 18 values. Your task is to indicate their importance to YOU, as guiding principles in YOUR life. Study each value carefully and decide whether it is Very Important, Important, or Not Very Important to you.

Make your answer for each value by circling:

0, if that value is Not Very Important

1, if that value is Important

2, if that value is Very Important

Values	Not Very Important	Important	Very Important
Able (having needed skill)	0	1	2
Aiding (working to assist others)	0	1	2
Brave (defending what you believe)	0	1	2
Calm (in control of yourself)	0	1	2
Considerate (willing to excuse others)	0	1	2
Courteous (having good manners)	0	1	2
Happy (merry, joyful)	0	1	2
Neat (well-groomed, tidy)	0	1	2
Open-minded (not prejudiced)	0	1	2
Original (bold, inventive)	0	1	2
Reliable (worthy of trust)	0	1	2
Respectful (doing your duty)	0	1	2
Self-directed (managing on your own)	0	1	2
Sensible (orderly in thought and action)	0	1	2
Smart (bright, clever)	0	1	2
Striving (getting ahead in life)	0	1	2
Truthful (meaning what you say)	0	1	2
Warm-hearted (gentle, showing affection)	0	1	2

Research for Better Schools, Inc. © 1976

CODE NUMBER _____ DATE _____

VALUES SURVEY (continued)

B. Decide which of the values you just rated are your top 3, the 3 most important values in your life. As you decide, write them down in the places provided below (just write the main word, not the other words in parentheses):

Most important value: _____

Next most important value: _____

Third most important value: _____

GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE

CODE NUMBER _____ DATE _____

PUTTING VALUES INTO ACTION

First, look back on your Values Survey and write in the spaces below your 3 most important values.

Then immediately below each value (where it says "Things done"), briefly describe some things *you* have done recently that are related to that value.
To be counted as a "Thing Done", each of the things you list should tell *when* you did it.

Most important value: _____

Things done:

Next most important value: _____

Things done:

Third most important value: _____

Things done:

Scoring Directions for
Values Survey and
Putting Values Into Action

There are three pages. (Two page one's are included in this appendix in order to provide both forms of the measure).

Page 1: Do not score.

Page 2: Scoring depends on the list of words given on Page 1. One list begins with "Ambitious," the other begins with "Able." For the "Ambitious" list, score by counting the occurrences of the terms or synonyms of the terms: Forgiving, Helpful, Honest, Responsible. For the "Able" list, score by counting the occurrences of the terms or synonyms of the terms: Aiding, Considerate, Reliable, Truthful. Do not score repeated terms. Scores may be 0, 1, 2, or 3.

Page 3 -- Putting Values into Action: There are three items (one for each of the top three values: "Most," "Next," and "Third"). For each item, count the number of activities listed that are (1) relatable to the value listed (for junior high school students), (2) stated to imply that they were conducted by the writer (not by someone else), and also are (3) relatively specific (not just a behavior disposition like "always tell the truth"). Note that instructions require some statement of when the action was taken. The reason for asking when is to get the writers away from generalities. Actually they need not state when explicitly, but the scorer should be able to envision what's listed as a perceivable activity or activities that the writer actually has done. Record the total scorable activities for each item. Then add to get a total for the three items together.

CODE NUMBER _____ DATE _____

BEFORE YOU DECIDE . . .

In each of the four cases described below, you are a person who must make a decision. But on each of the cases, you may need to know more or talk over something before you decide.

Read each case carefully. Then write in the space after the description all of what you think you would say or ask *before* making the decision.

Case 1: You are taking care of two little kids. They are fighting over who will get to play with a toy. You think you could get them to stop fighting if you just take the toy away from both of them. What more would you need to know or think over before deciding to take away the toy?

Case 2: You were elected to the Teen Committe of a community center in your neighborhood. The Committee might be able to get a famous jazz band for a party that has been planned for two weeks from now. If you get the band, instead of just having records for music, the center would have to charge much more for admissions tickets in order to pay the band. What would you need to know or need to talk over before deciding whether to vote to get the band or to have records for the party?

Research for Better Schools, Inc. ©1976

CODE NUMBER _____ DATE _____

BEFORE YOU DECIDE . . . (continued)

Case 3: You are the President of the United States, and you are trying to do something about the energy crisis. Your advisors have said that U.S. companies and other organizations should not send food to countries that charge too much for the oil that is sold to the U.S. What would you need to know or need to talk over before deciding whether to use your power to cut out food shipments to these countries?

Case 4: You are a member of the City Council. The Council is about to vote on whether some old rundown houses may be torn down to make room for building new apartment buildings. What would you need to know or need to talk over before deciding how to vote?

Scoring Directions for
Before You Decide

There are four items: Cases 1, 2, 3, and 4. Score each item for the number of "ethical" issues listed. An "ethical" issue is one related to fairness, justice, concern for or duty to others (including corporate bodies), humanitarianism, or equity for people possibly involved. Ethical issues may be contrasted with for example, issues of practicality, social acceptability, and preferences (likes and dislikes) of particular people. (Don't try to categorize each thing listed, just count the ethical issues.) Here are examples of each type of issue for each of the cases. (Give points for ethical issues only.)

Case 1 examples: Ethical issue - a. Whose toy is it? b. Would they take turns using the toy? c. Who had it first?
Practical issue - Would it solve the problem?
Acceptability issue - Would kids like you if you took the toy away?
Preference issue - Would the kids be unhappy?

Case 2 examples: Ethical - a. Will kids be excluded if they cannot pay? b. How would the kids who elected me want me to vote?
Practical - Will people come if we have the records? Can we get the band?
Acceptability - What would the other people on the committee think of me if I voted for the band/records?
Preference - Do I like the band?

Case 3 examples: Ethical - a. Would the people starve? b. What if every country stopped sending something that was really needed?
Practical - Would it work?
Acceptability - Would other countries still like the U. S.?

SCORING DIRECTIONS FOR
BEFORE YOU DECIDE... (Cont'd)

(Case 3 cont'd)

Preference - How friendly are we with the country?

Case 4 examples: Ethical - a. What about the people in the rundown houses? b. What's the best thing for all the city's people?

Practical - How much would it cost?

Acceptability - Would you get reelected?

Preference - Would the new buildings be more attractive?

If an answer is ambiguous, do not assign it a point.

When nothing is written in the item answer space and if the person answered items after that one, assign the item a score of 0. Otherwise, assign the item a dash (-) and do not obtain a total score that involves that item.

Record the number of ethical issues raised for each of the four items. Then, get sums for items 1 and 4 and items 2 and 3. Finally, record the total score.

CODE NUMBER_____ DATE _____

WHAT HAPPENS TO WHOM?

DIRECTIONS: Read the four paragraphs A, B, C, and D. Each of the paragraphs is really only the first part of a story.

For each paragraph, think about what might happen in the rest of the story. Think about what would happen to the people in first part of the story and to other people not in the first part of the story.

Then, under where it says "People", write all the people you can think of that might be in the rest of the story.

And, under where it says "What Happens to the People?", write for each of the people a couple of words telling how they might feel or something that might happen to them in the rest of the story.

A. It was Mimi's birthday party. She and ten friends, including you, went to the Ice Cream Palace to celebrate. It was fairly crowded, but the manager found two booths for the group. You were all having a great time talking back and forth between booths. One man at the counter nearby looked over at you and said "Can't you quiet down!" You decided to ignore him and the party continued as before.

People *What Happens to the People?*

B. Your class at school was just finishing up the school's first "Saturday Family Festival". The school might have other Saturday Festivals if this one worked out okay. As you are leaving with your family, you see that there is trash all over the place. You begin to pick up trash.

People *What Happens to the People?*

Research for Better Schools, Inc. ©1976

CODE NUMBER _____ DATE _____

WHAT HAPPENS TO WHOM? (continued)

C. One day in class one of your teachers embarrasses you in front of the whole class. You are really mad at the teacher. Three classmates who are friends of yours help you get back at the teacher by spraying paint all over the outside of the two windows of the classroom.

People *What Happens to the People?*

D. There is a new guy in your neighborhood. Some of the neighbors, including some of your friends, give this guy a hard time, because he is a foreigner and does talk and act differently from other people around. But you get to know him, because you want to find out more about things people do in his country.

People *What Happens to the People?*

Scoring Directions for
What Happens to Whom?

There are four items: A, B, C, and D. Score each item for the number of people listed as affected, with the following qualifications:

1. Count as one person each listing of a person or group of people (e.g., "other friends," "family," "the three classmates," "neighbors"). That is, a group mentioned just counts as 1. Any group in question (e.g., family, friends) that is broken into parts (e.g., Mom and Dad, Carl and Joyce) still receives only 1 point, unless different consequences are provided for the different group members. A person or group may be listed in any space under the question, even under the "What Happens to the People" column.

2. Count only those people (or groups) for whom a consequence is presented. The consequence must be judged by the scorer to be possible and to occur as a result of the last event in the story; that is, it should not be just an elaboration or repeat of the events in the story. If the same possible consequence is given for more than one person or group, credit 1 point for each.

Record a score for each item. When nothing is written and (a) if the person answered items after that one, score 0 for the item, or (b) if the person did not answer items after that one, score as incomplete, using a dash (-) for that item and all following items.

Then, record a score for items A and D together and a score for items B and C together. Finally, record a score for all items added together. Do not obtain a sum when any items involved are scored with a dash.

APPENDIX 8

ANALYSIS AND SUMMARY PROCEDURES USED WITH THE INTERVIEW AND CLASSROOM OBSERVATION REPORTS, AND SOME OF THE END-OF-COURSE QUESTIONNAIRE ANSWERS IN WRITING THE SEA CASE STUDIES

Analysis and Summary Procedures Used with the Interview and Classroom Observation Reports, and Some of the End-of-Course Questionnaire Answers in Writing the SEA Case Studies

The sections in this appendix deal with the procedures for analyzing and summarizing the SEA Teacher Reports, the interview and classroom observation reports, and the End-of-Course Questionnaire answers in answering questions concerning all topics covered in the case studies, except those pertaining to background of the cases, to achievement of objectives, and to general effects. The topics are presented here in the sequence in which they are discussed in each of the case studies.

Implementation

The implementation topics refer to various aspects of how the program was administered by the teacher. The major topic here is the extent to which the program was presented in the way intended by the course developers. Though the teachers were given a workshop orientation session and were encouraged to follow the developers' intents as manifest in the SEA Teacher's Manual, it was not expected that the teachers would follow every direction or that all of the developers intents were made explicit in the SEA Teacher's Manual. If these departures were great and numerous, the case study results have been reported with that qualification clearly presented.

Other implementation topics are also included because each reveals a feature of the students' contacts with SEA. In so far as the topics

also are helpful in interpreting acceptability and effectiveness results, relevant aspects of them shall be reported again under those topics.

Topic Title: Presentation Congruence

Question: To what extent did the teacher present the SEA lessons in the way intended by the developer?

Data Sources: The teacher's lesson report, as followed up through the periodic interviews, and classroom observation.

Analysis: Anything considered by the SEA evaluator or SEA field coordinator to be a departure from the presentation guides given in the Teacher's Manual were noted, and then discussed with the developer, who judged whether the departure was trival or important. If important, the departure was assigned a magnitude, an estimate of the impact of the departure on students' opportunity to achieve course objectives. The magnitude was taken from the percent of the course objectives directly related. If the departure was considered important, the reasons for the departure were noted, if such information was available.

Summary: The above percentages were summed to obtain an estimate of the magnitude from the developer's intent, and this estimate was converted into categories of departure as "none" (a zero percent sum), "slight" (less than ten percent), "moderate" (ten to thirty percent), "considerable" (30 to 60 percent), and "extensive" (about 60 percent) and reported as such. Additional discussion was included in the summary in order to present the reason for, and nature of any salient points of departure.

Topic Title: Presentation Time

Question: 1. How much classroom time was used to present the SEA lessons?

2. How many class sessions were used to present the SEA lessons?

3. What was the rate of lesson presentation (number lessons per week)?

4. Between which SEA lessons, if any, were there extended interruptions from holidays, etc?

Data Sources: The teacher's lesson report, as followed up through the periodic interviews. Also, for question 1 the periodic classroom observations were used. (The time observations were more accurate, even though only 1/4 to 1/3 of the class sessions were observed).

Analyses: Straightforward noting of dates each lesson presented, for questions 2, 3, and 4. For question 1, there were two separate analysis: One was the lesson time obtained from the teacher's report. The second was the lesson time obtained from the observation report, with such extraneous involvements as discussions unrelated to the lesson and outside disruptions that completely stop lesson presentation subtracted from the total time. In addition, any comments made by the teacher concerning presentation time were noted.

Summaries: Straightforward summary of data related to questions 2, 3, and 4. For question 1, there was a separate summary for each of the two analyses presented above. By comparing the teacher's and the observer's reports of time used for the observed lessons, a single estimate

of the average per lesson time was derived and an indication of variations was provided. Also, in order to provide a more complete understanding of the time used, the standard time period for the class, the students' involvement in discussions, and the extent of teacher feedback to students and omission of lesson parts may be discussed. Finally, where appropriate the comments by the teacher concerning presentation time were incorporated.

Topic Title: Fit Within Teacher's Program

Question: How did the teacher relate SEA to other subjects he or she taught?

Data Source: The periodic interviews, observations, and the final interviews.

Analyses: Recorded from the interview reports, and from the observations, noting what was conveyed to the students, and when it was conveyed.

Summary: No further summary; analysis results reported.

Topic Title: Student Accountability Procedures

Question: What procedures were used by the teacher to hold students accountable for their SEA studies?

Data Sources: The periodic observations and interviews and the final interview.

Analysis: Recorded from the interview and observation report, noting in so far as possible what the teacher led the students to expect.

Summary: No further summary; analysis results reported.

Topic Title: Student Absences

Questions: 1. To what extent were students absent from the SEA lesson presentations?

2. How did the teacher have students make up SEA lessons they had missed?

Data Sources: For question 1, the teacher's lesson reports, followed up by the periodic interviews and checked for accuracy with the observation reports. For question 2, the periodic interviews and final interview.

Analysis: For question 1, the number of students the teacher said were absent was recorded from each lesson. Also, the number from the observer's report was recorded. For question 2, the substance from the interview reports was recorded.

Summary: For question 1, the average percent of students in the class that the teacher said were absent per SEA lesson presentation were recorded and any evaluation relevant trends in the variability among lessons was noted. Also, any differences between the teacher's and the observer's records were commented upon. For question 2, the analysis results were reported without additional summary.

Acceptability

In contrast with the above topics dealing with how the course was presented, the following topics all relate to how whatever was presented as SEA was received, by the teacher and by the students.

Topic title: Adequacy of Teacher's Manual

Question: Did the teacher consider the SEA Teacher's Manual sufficiently complete and well-organized to provide at least adequate guidance for lesson presentations?

Data Sources: The teacher's lesson reports, supplemented by the periodic and final interviews.

Analysis: All comments concerning the teacher's perception of the Manual's adequacy or inadequacy -- e.g., degree of completness and ease of reference were recorded.

Summary: The analysis record was reported, with no additional summary unless it was possible to describe a common nature of the comments.

Topic Title: Reasonableness of Preparation Time and Resource Requirements

Question: Were preparation time and resources required for SEA lesson presentations within reasonable bounds for the teacher?

Data Sources: The teacher's lesson report, supplemented by the periodic interviews.

Analysis: Record each lesson for which either presentation time or resource requirements were considered beyond reasonable bounds. (The analysis did not include the teacher's answers resulting from his or her misinterpretation of the time issue as one of sufficient classroom presentation time, or of time required by being in the study).

Summary: The percent of SEA lessons for which preparation time or resource requirement exceeded reasonable limits for the teacher was determined.

Topic Title: Instructional Quality

Question: Did the teacher believe that the lessons provided good, or at least problem free instruction?

Data Sources: The teacher's lesson reports, followed by the periodic interviews, and the final interview.

Analysis: For each lesson, the percents of the lesson parts that were (1) considered especially good and (2) resulted in no problems were determined. (Analysis involved a review of the complete teacher's report and related interview, going beyond a simple counting of "G's and "N's, in order to check the sometimes incomplete or inappropriate use of the evaluation checkpoint codes). Also, the substance of the teacher's comments of this topic were recorded.

Summary: To summarize across lessons, a per lesson average of the two types of percent given above was obtained. (A comment was included in the summary when more than 5% of the teacher's codings in any category were revised to obtain the average). Also, the substance of the teacher's general comments were reported, and either generalizations about more specific comments were made or not included in the case report.

Topic Title: Appeal of Presentation Mode

Question: What were the teacher's and students' evaluations of the audio tape and visual features of the lesson presentations?

Data Source: The teacher's lesson reports and the periodic and final interviews, and observations of student reactions and related comments on end-of-course questionnaire.

Analysis: The substance of any teacher comment concerning the tapes and choice of tape where there were presentation options was recorded. Also, the substance and magnitude of the student responses were recorded.

Summary: The teacher's and students' comments, and the percents of the various presentation mode option choices were reported.

Topic Title: Classroom Management Problems Caused by SEA

Question: To what extent did the SEA classroom activities result in classroom management problems?

Data Sources: The teacher's lesson reports, supplemented by periodic interviews and classroom observations.

Analysis: For each lesson, activities, if any, which resulted in classroom management problems were determined and the percent of lesson parts involved were estimated where possible.

Summary: The instances revealed in the analysis were reported, the nature of the problem was presented if possible, and the percent of the course involved was estimated.

Topic Title: Difficulty

Question: To what extent were the SEA tasks and objectives at a level of difficulty appropriate for the students in general and for students of different verbal abilities?

Data Sources: The teacher's lesson reports, supplemented by the periodic interviews and observations, and the students' answers to the end of course questionnaire items 4a and 4b.

Analysis: From the teacher's and observer's accounts of each lesson, the nature and estimate of the percent of lesson activities or content that could be considered (1) too difficult for the students and (2) so easy as to be trivial was presented. From the student questionnaire, percent of students answering in each category to questions 4a and 4b was recorded and the relationship to the verbal ability scores were determined. (Not included here was social appropriateness -- e.g., embarrassment to putting on a drama. That event was included under Student Interest or Class Management. Also, "not used to working in groups," etc., was placed in Classroom Management). In addition, the relationship of the verbal ability scores to performance on the unit tests was recorded.

Summary: For a summary of the teacher's and observer's views, the per lesson averages of both (1) percent too difficult and (2) percent trival was determined. For a summary of the students views present the judgments of the majority, or at least plurality, on the basis of percent of students answering in each category for questionnaire items 4a and 4b, and the variation of answers and the relationship with the verbal ability score was described.

Topic Title: Harmlessness

Question: What aspects, if any, were considered harmful to students?

Data Sources: The teacher's lesson report, supplemented by the periodic interviews, observations of student reaction, and the students' answers on questionnaire item 5.

Analysis: From the teacher's reports, any instance of a harmful repercussion of an SEA lesson was recorded. From the students' questionnaire item 5 answers, the answer was classified as refering (1) to harmfulness of the course (e.g., invasion of privacy, being offended) or (2) to some other type of comment (e.g., some students indicate here that they were bored).

Summary: All relevant (number 1 type) details from the above analysis were reported and the percent of students listing harmful effects, (i.e., 1) was indicated and their comments were described and exemplified. If (2), it was placed in Student interest topic.

Topic Title: Student Interest Level

Question: Did students indicate they were involved and interested in SEA? What were specific aspects of the course that especially appealed to or involved students?...that were rejected by students?

Data Sources: The teacher's lesson reports, the periodic interviews, the classroom observations, and the students' answers to questionnaire items 6a and 6b.

Analysis: Teachers reports, the periodic interviews, and observations contained no checkpoints directly related to this topic. Therefore, these sources most likely contained only those specifics that indicated extraordinary interest in or rejection of SEA. These were categorized by the aspect of SEA in question and the positive or negative nature of the student reaction. Also, each student's answer to 6a was recorded and his or her answer to 6b was categorized on the basis of an a posteriori system.

Summary: Each source was summarized separately. Qualitative summaries were made for the information from the teacher and from the observer. The students answers were summarized in terms of percent of students responding in each category.

Effectiveness

The following topic is one of three presented in the case studies reports under the general category of effectiveness. The procedures for analyzing and summarizing the other two, achievement of objectives and general effects, are solely quantitative and are presented in the Data Analysis subsection of the Methods section of the report.

Topic Title: Other Effects of SEA

Question: Were any other effects of SEA perceived by the teacher, the students, or others?

Data Source: The teacher reports on lessons, the periodic interview and observation reports, the final interview (value to students and general sections) and the end-of-course questionnaire answers (in any of the open-ended items, but especially in items 3a and 3b)

Analysis: The nature and magnitude (i.e., number of students or others) of the effects and the source of the information were recorded.

Summary: The results of the analysis were presented, without further summary, unless several reports of the effects warranted a generalization. The categories of responses to ECQ item 3a that had a frequency of 20 percent and over were presented.